A REPLY

TO THE

CATHOLICK GENTLEMANS

ANSWER

TO

The most materiall parts of the Booke of SCHISME.

Whereto is annexed,

An Account of *H.T.* his *Appendix* to his *Manual* of *Controversies*, concerning the *Abbot of Bangors Answer* to *Augustine.*

By H. HAMMOND, *D.D.*

****
*****
***
*

LONDON,
Printed by *J. G.* for R. ROYSTON, at the *Angel* in *Ivie-lane.* 1654.

274'2
X ref. 262'8
cards
7066

A REPLY TO *The Catholick Gentlemans Answer to the Book of* SCHISME.

The Introduction.

N°1. THE *Letter* from the *Catholick Gentleman*, which undertakes to have *answered* the *most materiall parts of the Book of Schisme*, is said to expect some *account* from me. And I shall give it, if not quite, with the same *brevity*, yet directly in the same *method* which he hath chosen, *attending* him, as he shall please to *lead*, not by resuming the whole matter againe, but by *reflecting* on those *few* passages, which he hath thought good to take notice of, and freeing them from all though the *lightest exceptions*, which he hath made to them.

2. Upon this *account*, I shall say very little to his *Proœm* in these words,

SIR,

You have been pleased to send me Doctor Hammonds *Booke of Schisme, or a Defence of the Church of* England, *against*

the exceptions of the Romanists, as also your Letters, wherein you say commands on me to read it, and thereupon to give you my opinion: truly Sir, both the one and the other could never have come to me in better season, for having heard from some of my friends in England *a good while since, of another Book, written by Doctor* Ferne *to the same purpose, as also one lately come out, of the Bishop of* Derries, *and of this which you have sent me, I was wondring what those, who call themselves of the Church of* England, *could say to defend themselves from Schisme; but now through your favour of letting me see this of Doctor* Hammonds, *I am freed from my bondage, and satisfied, in supposition, that the most can adde little to what hath been upon that subject of Schisme said by him, whom you stile Wise and Learned, and well may he be so; but here he hath failed, as all men must that take in hand to defend a bad cause, which I thinke to make appeare to you, or any indifferent judge, and which I will doe rather upon some observations of severall passages in his book, than consideration of the whole, which I will leave for some other, who hath more leisure. In the meane time I must say with the Poet, speaking of some Lawyers in his time,*

Fures, ait Pedio, Pedius quid? Crimina raris
Librat in Antithetis:

The Roman Catholick sayes to Doctor Hammond, *You are an Heretick, you are a Schismatick, and Doctor* Hammond *replies good English, some Criticismes, much Greek, with many citations out of antiquity, indifferent to both parts of the question.*

3. I shall not here need solemnly to *averr* the *good* words bestowed on me, because 1. if they had been meant in earnest, they have yet no *influence* on the matter in hand: As *unlearned* a Man, as I, and as *learned* as he, which is by some *characters* thought to be the *Author* of this *Answer*, may agree in this *common* fate, that as one is not able to *defend* a *bad cause*, so the other hath not in any eminent manner *betrayed* a *good*: 2. because 'tis evident, that it was *designe*, and *artifice* to bestow the good words on me, that so he might

get himselfe the easier taske: And therefore the onely thing that is here necessary for me to tell the *Reader*, by way of *Proœme*, is, that since the publishing this *tract* of *Schisme*, that most *excellent* discourse on the same subject, written by the *Bishop* of *Derry* hath truly made that former care of mine very *unnecessary*, and so should in all reason have been undertaken and answered by this *Catholick Gentleman*, if he had really designed to *satisfie conscience* in this *question*. And should it be believed by him, what here he saith in the *Title* page, that he hath *answered* the *most materiall parts* of *Doctor* Hammonds *Book of Schisme*, yet I can assure him he is so much mistaken in his *supposall*, that there *can little be added by any to what hath been said by him*, that he is in all *justice* to undeceive the *Reader*, and make him *amends* by giving him not a *slight*, but *punctuall answer* to every part of that *Bishops Booke*, before he thinke he may safely charge the *Church* of *England* with *Schisme*, as still he adventures to doe.

4. Having said this, I shall make no kinde of *Reply*, to the rest of his *Proœme*, but proceed immediately to his first and onely *exception*, wherein the *first Chapter* is *concerned*.

Chap. I.

Of the cauſe of Schiſme being left out of this debate.

Sect. I.

No cauſe able to juſtifie Schiſme. Every voluntary Diviſion a Schiſme, whatſoever the motive were. Maſter Knot's *Teſtimony.*

Num. 1. His words are theſe,

But to draw neere your ſatisfaction, His firſt Chapter is, for the body of it, common to both parts, yet I cannot omit one ſtrange piece of Logick at the end of the firſt Chapter, Sect. 9. *where he concludeth, that the occaſion or motive of Schiſme is not to be conſidered, but onely the fact of Schiſme, Of which poſition I can ſee no connexion to any præmiſes going before, and it ſelfe is a pure contradiction, for not a Diviſion, but a cauſleſſe diviſion is a Schiſme, and how a Diviſion can be ſhewed to be unreaſonable and cauſeleſſe, without examining the occaſions and motives, I doe not underſtand, nor (with his favour) I thinke he himſelfe.*

2. What want of *Logick* there is in that *concluſion* of the *firſt Chapter*, which extorted this *animadverſion* from the *Romaniſt*, and what ſtore of that *faculty* (ſomewhat neceſſary to the managing of a *controverſie*) we are to expect from him, will ſoon be diſcernible by the view of that place which is accuſed by him, where having præmiſed the *criminouſneſſe* and *weight* of *Schiſme*, and *unexcuſableneſſe* of all, that, upon what provocation ſoever, breake the *unity* of the *Church*, I conclude that he that ſhall really be guilty of it, and the *fact*, wherein that guilt conſiſts, *proved* againſt him will no way be able to defend himſelfe by *pleading* the *cauſe* or *motive* to his *Schiſme*, there being no ſuch *cauſe* imaginable, which can juſtifie this *fact* of his, as both out of *Irenæus* and Saint *Auguſtine*

guſtine had been newly vouched. Upon which, my reſolution there, was (as to me ſeemed) but neceſſary, to divolve the *whole debate* into this one *quære*, whether we of the *Church* of *England* were *de facto*, guilty of this *crime*, were *Schiſmaticks* or no, concluding that if we were, there were nothing to be ſaid in *excuſe* of us.

3. From this view of the τὸ λογικὸν, the *rational* importance of that *Section*, 1. It is evident (what the *Romaniſt* profeſſeth not to be *able to ſee*) what is the *connexion* of my *poſition* to the *præmiſes* foregoing, *viz.* this, *no cauſe* can excuſe the *Schiſmatick*, therefore the *examination* of the *cauſe* is *unneceſſary*, whatſoever can be pretended on that head, is not worth the *producing* or heeding in this matter.

4. 2. 'Tis as evident how farre the *poſition* it ſelfe is removed from being a *contradiction*, which yet the *Romaniſts Logick* hath pronounced to be a *pure* one. A *pure contradiction* is in our *Logick*, *eſt* and *non eſt*, *It is a Schiſme*, and *It is not a Schiſme*, It is *cauſleſſe*, and it is *not cauſleſſe*, and the like. But certainly my concluding that *no cauſe can juſtifie a Schiſme*, or if the *Schiſme* be *proved*, tis in *vain* to *plead* that we had *cauſe* for it, containes no ſuch *contradictory* enuntiations. He that ſhould ſay that a *Seditious* perſon or a *Rebell*, is worthy of *death* whatſoever *cauſe* it were that incited him to that *villanie*, doth neither affirme the *Rebell* to be *no Rebell*, nor the *cauſe* he pretends, to be *no cauſe*, onely he ſaith indeed, that whatſoever the *cauſe* be, 'tis *incompetent* to *juſtifie* ſo *foule* a *fact*.

5. 3. The *proofe*, which he addes to conclude this *poſition* to be a *pure contradiction*, is very farre from *proving* it. The *proof* is this, *for*, ſaith he, *not a diviſion*, *but a cauſeleſſe diviſion is a Schiſme*. But this hath been ſhewed to have no truth in it, becauſe *Diviſion* and *Schiſme* being exactly the ſame, one a *Latine*, the other a *Greek* word, every *Diviſion* is and muſt neceſſarily be, in him who is guilty of it, a *Schiſme*, and if a *voluntary Diviſion*, a *criminous Schiſme*, whatſoever were the *motive* or *cauſe* of it, by *Diviſion* or *Schiſme* underſtanding (as I declare my ſelfe to doe) a *ſpontaneous receding*, or *dividing* from the *unity* of the *Church*, not being *cut off* or *driven* from it.

Laſtly,

6. Laſtly, what he addes as a *conſectary* of his *proof*, that [*he doth not underſtand how a Diviſion can be ſhewed unreaſonable and cauſeleſſe, without examining the occaſions and motives*] he may now, if he pleaſe, without much *difficulty* comprehend, *viz.* by conſidering, that no *cauſe* or *reaſon*, how weighty ſoever, is ſufficient to juſtifie a *diviſion*. For as long as this is either *proved* or *granted*, the *concluſion* will be *indubitable*, without examining of the *motives*, that the *Diviſion* is *unreaſonable* and *cauſeleſſe*. Let it once be *granted* or *proved* by the *known* Lawes of a *Nation*, that every act of *Sedition* is a *tranſgreſſion* of *Law*, *criminous* and *puniſhable*, whatſoever the *motive* be that incited it, and then there will need no more than *conviction* of the *fact*, to conclude that *fact* unreaſonable. That which is in it ſelfe ſo *culpable* and *inexcuſable*, that no *reaſon* whatſoever can be able to *juſtifie* it, is ready for the *ſentence* of *condemnation*, without farther proceſſe; when 'tis *reaſonably* reſolved, that no *reaſon* can *excuſe* ſuch a *fact*, what *reaſon* can there be to loſe time in *examining reaſons*? This is the very caſe in hand, as 'tis apparent to any that will but view the place, and 'tis not much for my incouragement in this taske, that the *Gentleman*, to whom I muſt reply, was willing to think this ſo deep a *riddle*, ſo much above *common* underſtandings.

7. I ſhall here only adde, that what was thus ſaid, was not in reaſon to provoke the *Romaniſt*, being a *conceſſion* that cut me off from many viſible *advantages*, and ſo deſerved his *reward*, much better than *rebuke*, and being thus *early* and *unexpectedly* fallen under his ſhort *diſpleaſure*, by my indeavour to *oblige* him, I have yet a *ſhield*, which promiſeth me ſecurity from the *continuance* of it, I meane not the *evidence* of the *truth* affirmed by me, (for that is not an *amulet* alwaies to be depended on, when it is againſt *intereſt* to acknowledge it) but the *ſuffrage* of his owne great *Champion Maſter Knot*, who hath directly *affirm'd* what *I affirmed* (and therefore I may be allowed not to *underſtand*, how this ſhould be ſo *unintelligible*) citing it out of Saint *Auguſtine*, That *there is no juſt neceſſity to divide unity*, *And that it is not poſſible that any man have juſt cauſe to ſeparate*—*Infidels unmasked*

masked, cap. 7. num. 5. And ſo it is as manifeſt that this part of the *firſt Chapter* is *common to both*, as the *former* of which he *affirmes* it, the *concluſion* in all reaſon being involved in the ſame *condition* which belonged to the *Præmiſes*, and it was onely my ill *luck*, or his *willingneſſe* to finde *fault*, that it was not formerly *apprehended* to be ſo.

Chap. II.

Concerning Hereſie, Excommunication, Infallibility.

Sect. I.

Of paſſing ſlightly over the difference betwixt Hereſie and Schiſme.

Nũ. 1. The *exceptions* to the *ſecond Chapter* are *three*; the *firſt* concerning *Hereſie*, the *ſecond* concerning *Excommunication*, the *third* concerning *Maſter Knots conceſſion*, which uſhers in a Diſcourſe of *Infallibility*.

2. The former in theſe words,

He ſlightly paſſeth over the diſtinction of Hereſie and Schiſm, as if he would not have it underſtood, that all Hereſie is Schiſme, though ſome Schiſme be no Hereſie.

3. What is here called the *ſlight paſſing over the diſtinction of Hereſie and Schiſme*, is one piece of injuſtice in him, and the cauſe to which it is affixt, my *unwillingneſſe* that it ſhould be *underſtood that all Hereſie is Schiſme*, will ſoon appear to be another.

4. For the *firſt*, It is evident that in that *Sect.* 3. of *Chap.* 2. I do not at all conſider the *diſtinction* of *Hereſie*, and *Schiſme*, nor could, without abſolute *interruption* and diſturbance of the *diſcourſe* in hand, & direct *tranſgreſſion* of all *rules* of *method*, ſay any thing to that *ſubject*, in that place. The thing that I there manifeſt is the *difference* betwixt *Excommunication* and *Schiſme* (and ſure that is not *Hereſie* and *Schiſme*, unleſſe *Excommunication* be *Hereſie*, and ſo the *puniſhment* of the *Sin* be the *Sin* it ſelfe) between the *paſſive* and the *active*, or *reciprocal diviſion* or *ſeparation*, and all that I ſay in

that *Section*, which can relate to *Hereſie*, is, that where the offence, for which a man is excommunicated, is *Hereſie* and not *Schiſme*, there it is evident, that his *Excommunication*, which ſtill is his *puniſhment* and not his *ſinne* (the *cauſe* of it alſo being not *Schiſme*, but ſomewhat elſe, *Hereſie*, or the like) cannot be the *guilt* of *Schiſme* in him that is ſo *puniſhed*.

5. Now it is evident, that I cannot be ſaid to *paſſe over* that *ſlightly*, which I doe not ſpeak to *at all*, and to which I had no *occaſion* to *ſpeake*, and conſequently that I was no way lyable to this *exception*.

6. And that being ſaid, the ſecond part of the ſame *exception*, that of the *ground* on which I doe this, muſt needs be as *cauſleſſe* as the former. For 1. 'tis certaine, that my *thoughts*, or *wiſhes*, or *deſignes*, are not things which can duely fall under this *objecters cognizance* (he cannot upon any ſure grounds, *divine* or affirme, what I aimed at in ſuch or ſuch a *ſlight paſſage*) and 2. 'tis yet more certaine, that no *collection* can juſtly be made from my doing that *ſlightly*, which I did not meddle with *at all*. But then 3. to remove all *ſcruple* or poſſible occaſion of *jealouſie* in this matter, 'tis the deſigne of *Chapter* 8. (the method then leading to it) under a ſecond ſort of *Schiſme*, to conſider the *departure* from the *Unity* of the *Faith*, which being but a *periphraſis* of *Hereſie*, is conſequently the defining all *Hereſie* is *Schiſme*, and ſo the profeſt avowing of that, which he ſuſpected me *unwilling to have underſtood*. And ſo ſtill there is not the leaſt appearance of *juſtice* in this ſuggeſtion.

Sect. II.

Excommunication how it differs from Schiſme. Wilfull continuance under cenſures is Schiſme. The Biſhop of Rome is not our Lawfull Governour. The ſevere conditions of their Communion.

Num. 1. HIs ſecond *exception* is perfectly of the ſame making with the former, thus,

Againe

2. *Againe*, ſaith he, *treating of Excommunication, he eaſily ſlideth over this part, that wilfull continuance in a juſt Excommunication maketh Schiſme.*

3. Here againe 'tis evident, that I treat not of *Excommunication*, nor have any occaſion fitly to treat of it, farther than to ſhew, that *Schiſme*, being a *voluntary ſeparation*, the word in no propriety pertaines to that act of the *Governour* of the *Church*, whereby he *ſeparates* or *cuts off* any by way of *Cenſures*. Certainly he that is put to *death* by *Sentence* of *Law*, cannot be judged a *Felo de ſe*, one that hath *voluntarily* put himſelfe out of the number of the *living*, or be liable to thoſe *forfeitures* which by the *Law* belong to ſuch. He that is *baniſhed* out of the *Kingdome* cannot be guilty of the *breach* of that *Statute*, which forbids all Subjects *going* out of it, nor be *puniſht* juſtly for that which is his *ſuffering*, not his *deed*; his *puniſhment*, not his *delinquency*.

4. As for his *wilfull* continuance under juſt *Cenſures*, the *wilfulneſſe* of that, certainly makes him *culpable*, and the *continuance* in *Excommunication*, being alſo *continuance* in *ſeparation* from the *Church*, which is *Schiſme*, whenſoever it is *voluntary*, I make no doubt of the *conſequence*, that ſuch *wilfull continuance* in *Excommunication*, be it *juſt* or *unjuſt*, is *actuall Schiſm*, ſuppoſing (as the word *wilfull* muſt ſuppoſe) that this *continuance* is wholly imputable to the *will* of the *Excommunicate*, i.e. that if he will *ſubmit* to that which is *lawfull* for him to *ſubmit* to, he may be *abſolved* and *freed* from it.

5. If this were it, that he would have had more *explicitely affirmed*, then I anſwer, that as there I had no *occaſion* to ſpeak to it, ſo now upon his *ſlighteſt* demand I make no ſcruple to give him my full ſenſe of it, that he, which being caſt into *priſon* for *juſt* cauſe, may upon his *Petition*, and promiſe of *Reformation* be releaſed, or if the *cauſe* were *unjuſt*, may yet without doing any thing any way *unlawfull*, regaine his *Liberty*, from thenceforth becomes not the *Magiſtrates*, but his *owne* Priſoner, and is guilty of all the *damage*, be it *diſeaſe*, *famiſhing*, *death* it ſelfe, which is conſequent to his *impriſonment*. And the *analogie* holds directly in *Excommunication*;

He that continues under the *Cenſures* of his *Eccleſiaſtical Ruler*, when he might fairely obtaine *abſolution* from them, is by *himſelfe ſentenced* to the *continuance* of this *puniſhment*, as by the *Governor* of the *Church*, to the *beginning* of it. But then all this while this is not the condition of *our Church*, in reſpect of the *Church* of *Rome*, they being not our *Lawful Superiors*, indued with *jurisdiction* over us, and for other *communion*, ſuch as alone can be maintained or broken among fellow-brethren, or *Chriſtians*, it is carefully maintained by us, as farre as it is *lawfully* maintainable.

6. And both theſe being there evidenced in that, and the inſuing *Chapters*, I did not *warily* or *purpoſely* abſtaine from (becauſe I had nothing that ſuggeſted to me any *opportunity* of) ſaying any thing more to *this* purpoſe. The *ſevere conditions* which are by the *Romaniſts* required of us to render us capable of their *communion*, *ſubſcription* of *error*, or *profeſſion* againſt *Conſcience*, make it *impertinent* to *propoſe* or *diſcuſſe* either of theſe *two* queſtions, 1. *Whether we lye under a juſt excommunication*, 2. *Whether, if we did, we would wilfully continue under it*, or conſequently, whether we be now *guilty* of *Schiſme* in this notion?

Sect. III.

Mr. Knots *conceſſion and concluſion. The power of a fallible Church to require beliefe. Of Antiquity, Poſſeſſion, Perſwaſion of Infallibility, Motives for Union. Uncertainty of the Proteſtants reaſons. The grand Hereſie and Schiſme of not believing Rome infallible. Beliefe ſufficient without infallibility. Fictions of Caſes.*

Num. 1. THe third *exception* inlargeth to ſome length, in theſe words,

2. *What he calls Maſter* Knots *conceſſion, I take to be the publike profeſſion of the Roman or Catholike Church, and that nature it ſelfe teacheth all rationall men, that any Congregation that can lye, and knoweth not whether it doth lye or no, in any pro-*

propoſition, cannot have power to binde any particular to believe what ſhee ſaith, neither can any man of underſtanding have an obligation to believe what ſhee teacheth, farther than agrees with the rules of his own reaſon: Out of which it followeth, that the Roman Churches binding of men to a profeſſion of Faith (which the Proteſtants and other hæreticall multitudes have likewiſe uſurped) if ſhee be infallible, is evidently gentle, charitable, right, and neceſſary, as contrariwiſe in any other Church or Congregation, which pretends not to infallibility, the ſame is unjuſt, tyrannical and a ſelfe-condemnation to the binders: ſo that the ſtate of the queſtion will be this, whether the Catholick or Roman Church be infallible or no, for ſhee pretendeth not to binde any man to tenets or beliefs upon any other ground or title: By this you may perceive much of his diſcourſe — to be not onely ſuperfluous and unneceſſary, but alſo contrary to himſelfe, for he laboureth to perſwade that the Proteſtant may be certaine of ſome truth, againſt which the Roman Catholick Church bindeth to profeſſion of error, which is as much as to ſay, as he who pretendeth to have no infallible rule by which to governe his Doctrine, ſhall be ſuppoſed to be infallible, and he that pretendeth to have an infallible rule, ſhall be ſuppoſed to be fallible; at moſt becauſe fallible objections are brought againſt him: now then conſider what a meek and humble Son of the Church ought to doe, when of the one ſide is the Authority of Antiquity and Poſſeſſion (ſuch Antiquity and Poſſeſſion without diſpute or contradictions from the adverſary, as no King can ſhew for his Crowne, and much leſſe any other perſon or perſons for any other thing) the perſwaſion of infallibility, all the pledges that Chriſt hath left to his Church for Motives of Union: on the other ſide, uncertaine reaſons of a few men pretending to learning, every day contradicted by incomparable numbers of men Wiſe and Learned, and thoſe few men confeſſing thoſe reaſons and themſelves uncertaine, fallible, and ſubject to error, certainly without a bias of intereſt or prejudice, it is impoſſible for him to leave the Chrch if he be in it, or not returne if he be out of it: for if infallibility be the ground of the Churches power to command beliefe, as ſhee pretends no other, no time, no ſeparation within memory of Hiſtory, can juſtifie a continuance out of the

Church: You may pleaſe to conſider then how ſolid this Doctors diſcourſe is, who telleth us, for his great evidence, that we, (ſaith he) who doe not acknowledge the Church of Rome to be infallible, may be allowed to make certaine ſuppoſitions (that follow there) The queſtion is, whether a Proteſtant be a Schiſmatick becauſe a Proteſtant? and he will prove he is not a Schiſmatick, becauſe he goeth conſequently to Proteſtant, that is Schiſmatical grounds: I pray you reflect, that not to acknowledge the Church to be infallible is that for which we charge the Doctor with Schiſme and Hereſie in Capite, *and more than for all the reſt he holds diſtinct from us, for this principle taketh away all beliefe, and all ground of beliefe, and turneth it into uncertainty and weather-cock opinion, putteth us into the condition to be* circumferri omni vento Doctrinæ, *ſubmitteth us to Atheiſme and all ſort of miſcreancy, let him not then over-leap the queſtion, but either prove this is not ſufficient to make him a Schiſmatick and an Heretick too, or let him acknowledge he is both.*

3. This diſcourſe thus inlarged to the *conſideration* of *fallibility* and *infallibility* in a *Church*, is certainly a *digreſſion* in this place, and taking the occaſion from ſome words of mine, *Sect.* 6. of a *conceſſion* of Maſter *Knots*, it is a little neceſſary to recount, what *conceſſion* that was, and the uſe that I there made of it, that ſo it may appeare, whether there were any thing *blameable* in my *procedure*.

4. The ſubject I was upon, *Sect.* 5. was the undoubted *lawfulneſſe* of being and continuing *excluded* from any ſuch *Church*, the *conditions* of whoſe *communion* containe *Sin* in them. To this *head* of diſcourſe I mentioned a *conceſſion* of Maſter *Knots*, that it is perfectly *unlawful to diſſemble, equivocate, or lye in matters of Faith*, and this as a *confirmation* of my then preſent *aſſertion*, that when I am not *permitted* by the *Romaniſts* to have *external communion* with them, unleſſe I doe thus *diſſemble, equivocate* and *lye*, affirme my ſelfe to *believe* what I doe *not believe*, I may lawfully *continue* thus *excluded* from their *communion*. But then I could not juſtly conceale what Maſter *Knot* there added as his *concluſion* from hence (together with the acknowledged *unlawfulneſſe* of forſaking the *externall communion* of *Gods viſible Church*) that there-

therefore the *Church* of *Rome* is *infallible*, becauſe otherwiſe men might *forſake* her *communion*.

5. Here indeed I thought it very *ſtrange*, that this *concluſion* ſhould be thus deduced from ſuch *præmiſſes*, that it ſhould be deemed *lawful* to ſeparate from a *Church* for every *error*, or for no more but being *ſubject* to *error*, being *fallible*, though it were actually guilty of no *errour*, which I conceived to be the ſame in *effect*, as to *affirme* it *lawfull* to *forſake* the *communion* of all but *Saints*, and *Angels*, and *God* in Heaven, becauſe all others were *peccable* and *fallible*. But yet I thought not fit to goe farther out of my way to *preſſe* the *unreaſonableneſſe* of it, but contented my ſelfe with that, which was for my preſent turne, his *confeſſion* that it was *lawful* to *ſeparate* or *continue* in *ſeparation* from the *Church* of *Chriſt*, in caſe we could not without *lying*, &c. be permitted to *communicate* with it.

6. This being the whole buſineſſe, as it lyes viſible to any in that 5. and 6. *Sect.* Let us now ſee what a *confuſion* is made to gaine ſome ſmall *advantage* from hence, or *excuſe* for a long *digreſſion*.

7. Firſt it is the *concluſion*, viz. [*that any Congregation that can lye*, &c. *cannot have power to binde any to believe what ſhee ſaith*] which he ſaith is called by me *Maſter Knots conceſſion*. But this is a great *miſtake*, I never lookt on this as his *conceſſion*, never called it by that title, but as a *concluſion* that he made a ſtrange *ſhift* to deduce from another *conceſſion*.

8. A *conceſſion*, this *Gentleman* ſhould in reaſon have underſtood to be ſomewhat which the *Adverſary* yeilds, and which the *diſputer* gaines *advantage* by his *yeilding* it, ſuch was his *aſſertion*, that *all lying* and *diſſembling* was *unlawful*, and that rather than that ſhould be admitted, it were *lawful* to *forſake* the *external communion* of the *Church* of *Chriſt*. And that, and nothing but that, was by me cited as his *conceſſion*.

9. Secondly, That *concluſion* it ſelf, that the *Congregation that is fallible cannot have power to binde to believe*,—is not ſo much as *conſidered* by me in that place or elſe where; I ſaid not one word

word againſt it, which might provoke this *objector* to take it up, and confirme it, neither was it in the leaſt *needfull*, or pertinent to the matter then in hand, to enter into the *conſideration* of it. All that was by me taken notice of (and that but in *paſſing*) was the *conſequence* or *coherence* betwixt the *præmiſſes* and that *concluſion*, which naturally inferred a third thing, that it was in *Mr. Knots* opinion, *lawful to forſake the Communion of any fallible Church*, which I thought by the way, would be ſure to excuſe us (though we ſhould be granted to have *forſaken* and *continued wilfully* in *Separation* from the *Roman Church*) if it *might but appeare, that either that were guilty of any one error, or lyable to fal into any one.* And this being intirely all that was there ſaid by me, there is no reaſon I ſhould ſo far attend this *Gentleman* in his *digreſſion*, as to conſider what here he proceeds to ſay, upon his new-ſprung ſubject of diſcourſe, very diſtant from that of *Schiſme*, to which I indeavoured to *adhere*, having elſewhere purſued at large, the *Romaniſts* other *hypotheſis* concerning their *Churches Infallibility*.

10. Were it not thus *remote* from our matter in hand, and perfectly unneceſſary to the *defence* of our *Church* from *Schiſme*, I might diſcover farther many infirme parts in this *procedure*. I ſhall but briefly touch on ſome of them.

11. 1. For the truth of that *propoſition* [*that a Congregation that can lye*, i. e. *a Church that is fallible, and knoweth not* (*i.e.* hath no *infallible certainty*) *whether it lye or no in any propoſition, cannot have power to binde any to believe what ſhe ſaith*] I may certainly affirme, 1. That this is no *infallible* truth, being no where affirmed by any *infallible* ſpeaker, or deduced from any *infallible* principle. For as to the *Scripture*, it is not pretended to be *affirmed* by that, and for *Natural Reaſon*, that cannot be an *infallible Judge* in this matter of defining what power may be, or is by *God* given to a *Church*, without *defining* it *infallible*. A *Prince* may no doubt be impowered by *God* to give *Lawes*, and thoſe *Lawes oblige* Subjects to *obedience*, and yet that *Prince* never be imagined *infallible* in making *Lawes*. And *natural reaſon* cannot conclude it impoſſible

poſſible, that a *Church* ſhould have a *proportionable* power given it by *God* to binde *belief*, &c.

12. As for the *Catholick* or *Roman Church*, 1. that is a *miſpriſion*, the *Catholick* is not the *ſingle Roman Church*, nor the *Roman* the *Catholick*. 2. There no where appears any ſuch *definition*, either of the *Catholick*, i.e. *Univerſall Church* of *God*, or particularly of the *Roman Church*, no act of *Councell* repreſentative of that *Church*, no known affirmation of that *diffuſed* body under the *Biſhop* of *Rome's Paſtorage*, that all *authority* to oblige *belief* is founded in *Infallibility*. 3. If any ſuch *definition* did appear, it could no way be *foundation* of *belief* to us, who doe not *believe* that *Church*, or any *definition* thereof, as ſuch, to be *infallible*.

13. 2. If we ſhall but *diſtinguiſh* and limit the termes, 1. what is meant by [*can lie*] 2. By *knowing* or *not knowing* whether it *lie* or no, 3. By *power to binde*, 4. By *belief* (as every of theſe have a *latitude* of ſignification, and may be eaſily miſtaken, till they are duly *limited*) It will then ſoon appear that there is no *unlimited truth* in that which he ſaith is the whole *Churches* affirmation, nor *prejudice* to our *pretenſions* from that *limited* truth, which ſhall be found in it.

14. 1. The phraſe [*can lie*] may denote no more than ſuch a *poſſibility* of *erring*, as yet is joyned neither with *actuall error*, nor with any *principle*, whether of *deficiency* on one ſide, nor of *malignity* on the other, which ſhall be ſure to betray it into *error*. Thus that particular *Church*, that is at the preſent in the *right*, in all matters of *faith*, and hath before it the *Scripture* to guide it in all its *deciſions*, together with the *traditions* and *doctrines* of the *antient* and *Primitive Church*, and having skill in all thoſe knowledges, which are uſefull to fetch out the true *meaning* of *Scripture*, and ability to inquire into the *antient* path, and to compare her ſelf with all other conſiderable parts of the *Univerſall Church*, and then is *diligent* and faithfull to make *uſe* of all theſe *ſuccours*, and in uprightneſs of heart *ſeeks* the truth, and applies it ſelf to *God* in humble, and ardent, and continuall prayer for his *guidance to lead into all truth*, This *Church*, I ſay, is yet *fallible*, *may* affirm and teach *falſe*, i.e. this is *naturally* poſſible that it may, but

it is not ſtrongly *probable* that it will, as long as it is thus *aſſiſted*, and *diſpoſed* to make *uſe* of theſe *aſſiſtances*, and means of true *defining*.

15. 2. That *Churches knowledge*, whether it *define truly* or no in any *propoſition*, may ſignifie no more than a *full perſwaſion* or *belief* (*cui non ſubeſt dubium*, wherein they neither *doubt* nor apprehend *reaſon* of *doubting*) that what they *define* is the very *truth*, though for *knowledge* properly ſo called, or *aſſurance*, *cui non poteſt ſubeſſe falſum*, which is *unerrable* or *infallible* in ſtrictneſs of ſpeech, it may not have *attained*, or pretend to have *attained* to it.

16. 3. By *power to binde* may be meant no more than *authority* derived to them from the *Apoſtles* of *Chriſt* to make *deciſions*, when difficulties ariſe, to preſcribe *rules* for *ceremonies* or *government*, ſuch as ſhall oblige inferiors to due *obſervance* and *obedience*, by force of the *Apoſtles* πείθεσθε ἡγουμένοις, his *precept* to *obey* the *rulers* ſet over us in the *Church*, which we may doe without thinking them ſimply, or by any *promiſe* of *God*, *inerrable* or *infallible*, as the *obedience* which is due to *civil* Magiſtrates, which ſuppoſes in them a *power* of *binding ſubjects* to *obey*, doth yet no way ſuppoſe or imply them *uncapable* of *erring* and *ſinning*, and giving *unreaſonable* commands, and ſuch as wherein it is *unlawfull* to yeild obedience to them.

17. Beſide this, there may farther be meant by it a *generall obligation* that lies on all men, to *believe* what is with due grounds of *conviction* propoſed to them, ſuch as the *disbelieving* or *doubting* of it ſhall be in them *inſeparable* from *obſtinacy*; and this *obligation* is again the greater, when that which is thus *convincingly* propoſed, is propoſed by our *ſuperiors*, from whoſe mouth it is regular to *ſeek* and *receive Gods will*.

18. *Laſtly*, *Believing* may ſignifie not an implicite, *irrational*, *blinde*, but a well-grounded, *rationall*, explicite *belief* of that which, as the truth of *God*, is duely propoſed to us; or again, where there is not that degree of *manifeſtation*, yet a *conſent* to that which is propoſed as moſt *probable*, on the *grounds* afforded to judge by, or when the perſon is not competent to

ſearch

ſearch *grounds*, a bare yeilding to the *judgment* of *ſuperiours*, and deeming it better to adhere to them, than to attribute any thing to their own *judgment*, a *believing* ſo farre as not to *disbelieve*. And this again may *rationally* be yeilded to a *Church*, or the *Rulers* and *Governors* of it, without deeming them *inerrable* or *infallible*.

19. Nay, where the *propoſition* defined is ſuch, that every member of that *Church* cannot without *violence* to his underſtanding yeild any ſuch degree of *belief* unto it, yet he that believes it not, may behave himſelf *peaceably* and *reverently*, either duely repreſenting his *grounds*, why he *cannot* conſent to it, or if his *ſubſcription* or *conſent* be neither *formally* nor *interpretatively* required of him, quietly enjoy his *contrary* opinion. And this may tend as much to the *peace* and *unity* of a *Church*, as the perſwaſion of the *inerrability* thereof can be ſuppoſed to doe.

20. By this view of the *latitude* of theſe terms, and the *limitations* they are capable of, it is now not ſo difficult to diſcern, in what ſenſe the *propoſition* under conſideration is *falſe*, and in what ſenſe it is *true*, and by us acknowledged to be ſo.

21. A *congregation* that is *fallible*, and hath no knowledge or *aſſurance* (*cui non poteſt ſubeſſe falſum*) that it is not deceived in any *particular propoſition*, may yet have *authority* to make *deciſions*, &c. and to require *inferiors* ſo farre to *acquieſce* to their *determinations*, as not to *diſquiet* the *peace* of that *Church* with their contrary opinions.

22. But for any *abſolute infallible belief* or conſent, that no *Church*, which is not it ſelf abſolutely *infallible*, and which doth not *infallibly know* that it is *infallible*, hath power to require of any.

23. By this it appears in the next place, in what ſenſe it is *true*, which in the following words is *ſuggeſted* of *Proteſtants*, that they *binde men to a Profeſſion of Faith*, and how injuſtly it is added, that, *ſuppoſing them not to be infallible, it is unjuſt, tyrannical, and ſelf-condemnation to the binders*. The contrary whereto is moſt evident, underſtanding the *obligation* with that *temper*, and the *infallibity* in that notion, wherein it is evident we underſtand it. For what *injuſtice* or *tyranny* &c.

can it be in any *lawful ſuperior*, having defined what verily he believes to be the truth of *God*, and no way doubts of his having deduced it rightly from the *Scripture*, but yet knows that he, as a *man*, is *fallible*, and that it is *poſſible* he may have ſome way *failed* in this, as in any other his moſt *circumſpect* action, what *injuſtice*, I ſay, can it be, *authoritatively* to direct this *definition* to thoſe, who are committed to his *charge*, and expect their due *ſubmiſſion* to it? meaning by *ſubmiſſion*, what I have here expreſt to mean by it.

24. So again it appears of the *Roman Church*, how far it is from *gentle* or *charitable* in them to bind men to *profeſs*, as *matter* of *faith*, whatſoever is by that *Church* defined, upon this one account, that the *Church* is *infallible* & can't *erre*; when this very thing, that it is *infallible*, is not at all made *probable*, much leſſe *infallibly* deduced frō any *reaſon* or *teſtimony* that is *infallible*.

25. Next then, when he ſaith, that *the ſtate of the queſtion will be this, whether the Roman Church be infallible or no*, I am not ſure I know what *queſtion* he means, whether the main *Queſtion* on which the *Tract* of *Schiſme* was written, i. e. whether the *Church* of *England* be *ſchiſmaticall* or no, or whether the *particular queſtion*, which this *Gentlemans* haſte hath framed to himſelf in this place, Whether a *fallible Church* may have *power* to *binde* any to *believe* what ſhe ſaith? But I ſuppoſe by ſome *indications*, that the latter is it, and then, as from hence I learn what he means by *infallible*, a *Church* that cannot *poſſibly* erre, all whoſe *definitions* are ſuch, *quibus nequit ſubeſſe falſum*, ſo untill this be proved of that *Church*, I muſt be allowed to ſpeak like one who think not my ſelf *obliged* to the *belief* of it, and being ſure of this, that a *Proteſtant* is or may be verily perſwaded of ſome *truth*, againſt which the *Roman Church* bindeth to *profeſſion* of *error* (meaning by *verily perſwaded*, ſuch a *certainty* only, *cui non ſubeſt dubium*, he hath no *doubt* nor reaſon to induce *doubting* of it) I cannot imagine how that part of my *diſcourſe*, wherein I have *ſuppoſed* or *aſſerted* this, can be either *ſuperfluous*, *unneceſſary*, or (whatever other *weakneſs* it be guilty of) *contrary to my ſelf*. For certainly I that think I am *fallible*, may yet *verily believe*, without all *doubt*, the truth of many *propoſitions*, which

if

if I ſhould *affirm* my ſelf not to *believe*, I muſt doubtleſſe *lie*, and then *ſin*, by Mr. *Knot's* former *conceſſion*. And 'tis as certain on the other ſide, that he that pretendeth to have an *infallible* rule, may yet foully *miſtake*, both in that *generall*, *originall*, and in many other *particular*, *derivative* pretenſions; His ſuppoſed *infallibility*, if it be not rightly *ſuppoſed* (and till it be proved, it will not be ſo) will be ſo farre from an *amulet* to keep him ſafe from all *error*, that it is the *likelieſt* way to deliver him up to it, as the *premature perſwaſion* of his *particular election* may be the *ingulfing* any, through *ſecurity* and *preſumption*, in the moſt certain *ruine*.

26. In the proceſſe of this *diſcourſe* he is pleaſed to mention *four* advantages of the *Roman Church* above any other, *Antiquity*, *poſſeſſion*, *perſwaſion of Infallibility*, the *pledges* that *Chriſt* hath *left* to his *Church* for *motives* of *union*, and nothing but *uncertain reaſons* on the other ſide, which ſaith he, muſt make it *impoſsible for any without intereſt or prejudice to leave the Church, if he be in it, or not return, if he be out of it.*

27. To this imaginary ſetting of the *ſcales* between them and us, and particularly to the *fourth advantage* pretended to, the *pledges* that *Chriſt* left for *motives* of *union*, it is ſufficient to reply in *generall*, that for us, which have not *voluntarily ſeparated*, but are by them *violently* removed from *communion* with them, and cannot be admitted to *reunion*, but upon *conditions*, which without *diſſembling* and *lying* we cannot undergoe, it is in vain to ſpeak of *motives* or *obligations* to *return* to their *communion*. We that are *bound, as much as in us lies, to have peace with all men*, muſt not admit any *known* or *wilfull* ſin in order to that moſt *deſirable* end. And this one thing as alone it is pertinent to the matter in hand, that of *ſchiſme*, ſo it is neceſſarily the *concluding* of this *controverſie*, We that are not *permitted* to return, and ſo we are, if the *conditions* of our return be ſo *incumbred*, as to include *ſin*, cannot with any *juſtice* or *equity* be charged for not returning.

28. Againſt this here is nothing ſaid, any farther than the bare mention of the three other *advantages* on their ſide. And none of theſe are of any force to *perſwade* our *return*, upon ſuch *conditions* as theſe, much leſſe to exact it as duty from us.

29. By *Antiquity* and *poſſeſſion*, as *here* they are ſpoken of, I am apt to ſuppoſe he means not *antiquity* of the *Roman Church*, or the *preſent* doctrines (and therefore I ſhall not ſpeak of them) but the *antiquity* of our *communion* with them (if he mean a *Poſſeſſion* in the *belief* of the *Popes Univerſall Paſtor-*
* *Ch 7. Sect. 1.* *ſhip*, I ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak of that * hereafter.) And if this be granted, as for *fraternall communion*, and ſuch as is due from one *ſiſter Church* to another, it is willingly granted, then this will divolve the *blame* on thoſe who are *guilty* of this breach, who have caſt us out, and permit us no way of *returning* with a good *conſcience*, And ſo this is little for the *Romaniſts* advantage.

30. But if in ſtead of *fraternall communion*, it be *ſubjection* to the *Roman See*, that is by his words claimed, and pretended to by *poſſeſſion*, then as we willingly grant to that *See* all that the *antient Canons* allowed to it, and ſo cannot in that reſpect offend againſt *Antiquity*, ſo what, contrary to thoſe *Canons*, they have at any time *aſſumed*, and unlawfully *poſſeſt* themſelves of, can no way be pretended to be their right, or they to be *bonæ fidei poſſeſſores*, *true* or fair *poſſeſſors* of it, which *qualification* and *condition* is yet abſolutely neceſſary to found their plea from *poſſeſſion*, and which alone can bear any proportion with that, which *Kings* can ſhew for their *crowns*, or *proprietaries* for their *inheritances*.

31. Of this head of *poſſeſſion*, or *preſcription*, it were eaſie to adde much more, by conſidering that *claim* and *title*, by the known rules whether of the *Canon*, or *Civil Law*. The *Civil Law*, which is generally more *favourable* to *Preſcription*, doth yet acknowledge many waies of *interrupting* it, as by calling it into *queſtion*, and that is ſufficiently done in ſome caſes, *per ſolam conventionem*, by *citing*, or *ſummoning* the poſſeſſor, and when *conteſtatio litis*, the entring a *ſuit* is actually *required*, yet ſtill he that appears to have cauſed the *impediment*, and kept it from coming to this *conteſtation*, is not to gain any *advantage* by his *guilt*, but *adverſus eum lis habetur pro conteſtato*, *he ſhall be looke on*, *as if the ſuit had been actually conteſted againſt him*. See *Bartolus in l. ſi eum §. qui injuriarum in fi: ff. ſi quis caut:*

But

32. But as to the *Canon Law*, which in all reaſon the *Catholick* is to own in *this queſtion*, it is known that it admitteth not any the longeſt *preſcription*, without the *bonæ fidei poſſeſſio*, (he that came by any thing *diſhoneſtly*, is for ever obliged to *reſtitution*) and for the judging of that, allows of many waies of *probation*, from the *nature of the thing* (the courſe we have taken in this *preſent* debate) and from other *probable indications*, and where the appearances are *equal* on both ſides, the *Law*, though it be wont to judge moſt *favourably*, doth yet incline to *queſtion* the *honeſty* of coming to the *poſſeſſion*, and to preſume the *diſhoneſty*, upon this account, becauſe *mala fides*, *diſhoneſty* is preſumed induſtriouſly to contrive its own *ſecrecie*, and to lie hid in thoſe *receſſes*, from which at a diſtance of time it is not eaſily fetcht out. So *Felinus in C. ult: de præſcript: per leg: ult: C. unde vi.* And in a word, it is the affirmation of the *Doctors*, *preſumi malam fidem ex antiquiore adverſarii poſſeſſione*, the *preſumption* is *ſtrong that the poſſeſſion was not honeſtly come by, when it appears to have been antiently in the other hands*, and the way of *conveyance* from one to the other is not *diſcernible*. See *Panormit:* and *Felinus in c. ſi diligenti X de preſcript: Menochius arbitr: quæſt: Caſu* 225. *n.*4. and others referred to by the *learned Groti us in Conſil: Jurid: ſuper iis quæ Naſſavii*— *p.*36. &c. But I have no need of theſe *nicer diſquiſitions*.

33. As for the *perſwaſion* of *infallibility*, meaning, as they *muſt*, their *own perſwaſion* of it, that can have no *influence* upon us, who are ſure that we are not ſo *perſwaded*, unleſs the *grounds*, on which their *perſwaſion* is founded, be ſo convincingly repreſented to us, that it muſt be our *prejudice*, or other *vitious defect*, or *affection* in us, that we are not in the like manner *perſwaded* of it. But on this we are known to *inſiſt*, and never yet have had any ſuch *grounds* offered to us: As may in ſome meaſure appear by the *view* of that *Controverſie* as it lies viſible in the Book, intituled, *The view of Infallibility*.

34. As for the *uncertainty* of the *reaſons* on the *Proteſtants* ſide, by *uncertainty*, meaning *fallibility*, and the *poteſt ſubeſſe falſum*, whileſt yet we are, without *doubting*, verily *perſwaded* that our *reaſons* have force in them; that cannot make it

poſſible

poſſible for us to *believe* what we doe not *believe*, or *lawfull* upon any the *faireſt* intuition to *profeſſe* contrary to our *belief*. I believe that *Henry* VIII. was *King* of this *Nation*, and the *reaſons* on which I believe it, are, the *teſtimonies* of meer men, and ſo *fallible*; yet the bare *fallibility* of thoſe *teſtimonies* cannot infuſe into me any *doubt* of the *truth* of them, hath no force to *ſhake* that but *humane belief*, and while I thus *believe*, I am ſure it were *wilfull* ſin in me, though for the *greateſt* and moſt pretious *acquiſitions* in my *view*, to *profeſſe* I doe *not believe it*. The like muſt be ſaid of any other *perſwaſion* of mine, denied by the *Romaniſts*, and the *denying* whereof is part of the *condition* required of me to make me capable of *communion* with them.

35. But it is not now time to inſiſt on this, both becauſe here is *nothing* produced againſt it, and becauſe here follows a much *higher* undertaking, which ſwallows up all theſe *inferior* differences between us, *viz:* that not to *acknowledge* the *Church* (that muſt be the *Roman Church*) *to be infallible, is the great crime of ſchiſme and hereſie* in capite, *and more than all that I hold diſtinct from the Romaniſts.*

36. This I acknowledge was not foreſeen in the *Tract* of *Schiſme*, and may ſerve for the *una litura*, the *one anſwer* to remove all that is there ſaid. For if our *grand Fundamental ſchiſme* and *hereſie* be all ſummed up in this one *comprehenſive* guilt, our not acknowledging the *Church* of *Rome* to be *infallible*, then it was and ſtill is impertinent to diſcourſe on any other ſubject but that one of *Infallibility*, for if that be gained by them to belong to their *Church*, I am ſure we are concluded *Schiſmaticks*, and till it be gained, I am ſure there is no *reaſon* to *ſuppoſe* it.

37. But then as this is a *compendious* way of *anſwering* the *Tract* of *Schiſm*, and I wonder, after he had ſaid this, he could think it *ſeaſonable* to proceed to make exceptions to any other particulars, this one great *miſtake* of the *Queſtion* being diſcovered, made all other more *minute* conſiderations *unneceſſary* (as he that hath ſprung a *mine* to blow up the whole *Fort*, need not ſet *wiſpes* of ſtraw to ſeverall *corners* to *burn* it) ſo it falls out a little unluckily, that this doth not *ſuperſede*, but only

onely remove this *Gentleman's labour*, it being now as neceſſary that he ſhould defend his *hypotheſis* of the *Church* of *Romes Infallibility*, againſt all that is formerly ſaid by me on *that ſubject*, as now it was to make this *Anſwer* to the *Book* of *Schiſm*, and till that be done, or attempted to be done, there is nothing left for me to *reply* to in this matter.

38. For as to his bare *affirmations*, that the *not acknowledging* their *Infallibility takes away all belief and ground of belief, turns all into uncertainty*, &c. *nay, ſubmitteth to Atheiſme and all ſorts of miſcreancy*.] It is ſure but a *miſtake* or *miſunderſtanding* as of ſome other things, ſo particularly of the *nature* of *belief*; For beſide that I may have other *grounds* of *belief* than the *affirmations* of the *Roman Church*, the *authority* of *Scripture* for the ſeveralls contained in it, and the *Teſtimony* of the *univerſal Primitive* (that ſure is more than of the *preſent Roman*) *Church*, to aſſure me that what we take for *Scripture* is *Scripture*, and to derive *Apoſtolical traditions* to me, and ſo I may believe enough without ever knowing that the *Roman Church* defines any thing *de fide*, but much more without acknowledging the *truth* of all ſhe *defines*, and yet much more without acknowledging her *inerrable* and *infallible*: Beſide this, I ſay, it is evident that *belief* is no more than *conſent* to the *truth* of any thing, and the grounds of *belief*, ſuch *arguments* as are ſufficient to exclude *doubting*, to induce *convittion* and *perſwaſion*, and where that is actually induced, there is *belief*, though there be no pretenſe of *infallibility* in the argument, nor *opinion* of it in him that is perſwaded by it.

39. That all that *God* hath ſaid is *true*, I believe by a *belief* or *perſwaſion*, *cui non poteſt ſubeſſe falſum*, *wherein I cannot be deceived*, and there I acknowledge *infallibility* upon this ground, whether of *nature* or of *grace*, of *common* dictate, or of *religion*, that it is *impoſſible for God to lie*, to *deceive*, or to *be deceived*; But that the whole *Canon* of *Scripture*, as it is delivered to us by the *Laodicean Councel*, is the *Word* of *God*, though I fully *believe* this alſo, and have not the leaſt doubt to any part of it, yet I account not my ſelf *infallible* in this *belief*, nor can any *Church* that affirms the ſame, unleſſe they

are otherwiſe *priviledged* by *God*, be *infallible* in *affirming* it, nor any that *believes* that *Church* be *infallible* in their *belief*; And as that *priviledge* is not yet proved by any *donation* of *Gods* to belong to any *Church*, particularly to the *Roman*, ſo till it be *proved*, and proved *infallibly*, it can be no competent *medium* to induce any new *act* of *Infallible belief*, the want of which may denominate us either *hereticks* or *ſchiſmaticks*.

40. In the mean time, this is certain, that I that doe not pretend to *believe* any thing *infallibly* in this matter, not ſo much as that the *Church* is not *infallible*, muſt yet be acknowledged to *believe* her *fallible*, or elſe I could not by this *Gentleman* be adjudged a *ſciſmatick* for ſo *believing*: And then this ſuppoſeth that I may *believe* what in his *opinion* I believe *untrue*, that ſure is, that I may *believe* what I doe not *believe infallibly*. The matter is *viſible*, I cannot think fit to *inlarge* on it.

41. One thing onely I muſt farther take notice of, the *ground* which he here had, on which he *founds* his *exception* againſt the *ſolidity* of my *diſcourſe*, calling it my *great evidence*, that *we that doe not acknowledge the Church of* Rome *to be infallible, may be allowed to make certain ſuppoſitions that follow there.*

42. The matter in that place *Chap.* II. *Sect.* 12. lies thus. In examining the nature of *ſchiſme*, I have occaſion to mention one (not *reall*, but) *fiction* of *caſe*; Suppoſe *firſt* that our *Anceſtors* had *criminouſly* ſeparated from the *Church* of *Rome*, and ſuppoſe *ſecondly*, that we their *poſterity* repented, and deſired to *reform* their ſin, and to be *reunited* to them; yet ſuppoſing *thirdly*, that they ſhould require to our *reunion* any *condition* which were *unlawfull* for us to perform, in this conjuncture, I ſay, we could not juſtly be charged for *continuing* that *ſeparation*.

43. This *fiction* of caſe I could not think had any weak part in it, for as it ſuppoſed that on one ſide, which I knew a *Romaniſt* would not grant, *viz:* that they ſhould *require any condition unlawfull for us to perform*, ſo it ſuppoſed on the other ſide, that which we can no way grant, *viz:* that our *Anceſtors* criminouſly *ſeparated*; But this I knew was ordinary to be done in *fictions* of caſes; *Suppoſitio non ponit*, is the acknowledged

ledged rule, my *ſuppoſing* either of theſe was not the taking them for *granted*, And yet after all this, I foreſaw that *objection*, that the *Romaniſt*, who acknowledges not any ſuch hard *condition* required to our *reconciliation*, will conceive this an *impoſſible* caſe; And to this I anſwered, that we, that acknowledge not their *Church* to be *infallible* may be allowed to make a *ſuppoſition* (meaning as before a *fiction* of caſe) which is founded in the *poſſibility of her inſerting ſome error in her confeſſions, and making the acknowledgment of it the indiſpenſable condition of her communion*. What I have offended herein, I cannot imagine, for 1. I onely ſet a *fiction* of caſe, doe not take their *infallibility* for a thing confeſtly falſe, nor in that place ſo much as *diſpute* againſt it, Only I ſay that which was ſufficiently known before I ſaid it, that their *Infallibity* is not acknowledged by us, and ſo that her *inſerting* ſome *error* in her *Confeſſions*, is to us, i. e. in our *opinion* a thing *poſſible*, and ſo for *diſputation* ſake *ſuppoſable*, in the ſame manner as I ſuppoſe that which I am known not to *believe*, and if this *Gentleman* be thus *ſevere*, I ſhall deſpair to approve my *diſcourſes* to him.

44. *Secondly*, that I make it my *great evidence*, is not with any appearance of *reaſon* ſuggeſted by him, It comes in meerly as an *incidentall*, *laſt* branch, the leaſt neceſſary, moſt *unconſiderable* of any, and that which might have been *ſpared* then, or left out now, without any *weakning* of, or *diſturbing* the *diſcourſe*.

45. *Thirdly*, Whereas he adds, that I *proceed to make certain ſuppoſitions that follow there*, this is ſtill of the *ſame* ſtrein, I make but *one ſuppoſition*, viz: in caſe ſhe make any *unlawfull act* the *indiſpenſable condition* of her *Communion*, And that *one* certainly is not in the *plurall*, *more*, or indefinitely, *certain ſuppoſitions*.

46. That I put this *one* caſe as *poſſible*, and then proceeded to conſider, what were by the *principles* acknowledged by all, particularly by Mr. *Knot*, to be done in that one caſe, was agreeable to the ſtricteſt *laws* of *diſcourſe* which I have met with. And if in compliance with this *Gentleman*, I muſt deny my ſelf ſuch *liberties*, and yet yeild him ſo much *greater*, on

the other ſide, If I muſt at the *beginning* of a *defenſe* of the *Church* of *England*, be required to grant the *Church* of *Rome infallible*, i. e. to yeild not onely that ſhe ſpeaks *all* truth, but alſo that it is *impoſſible* ſhe ſhould ſpeak any thing but *truth*, whom yet, by entring on this theme, I undertake to *contradict*, and to prove injurious in *cenſuring* us for *Schiſmaticks*, this were, as I have ſaid, an *hard* task indeed, The very ſame as if I were required to begin a *duell* by preſenting and delivering up all *weapons* into the *enemies* hand, to *plead* a cauſe, and *introduce* my defenſe by *confeſſing* my ſelf *guilty* of all that the *plaintiffe* doth, or can have the confidence to *charge* upon me.

47. And if theſe be the *conditions* of a *diſpute*, theſe will queſtionleſſe be hard, whatſoever the *conditions* of our *reunion* be conceived to be, and moreover this *Gentleman* will be as *infallible* as his *Church*, and then 'tis pity he ſhould laviſh out *medicines*, that is ſo ſecured by *charms*, that he ſhould *defend* his cauſe by *reaſons*, which hath this one ſo much *cheaper* expedient, to *anſwer* a whole book in one *period*.

48. And ſo much for his *Animadverſions* on this *ſecond Chapter*, which are no *excellent preſage* of that which we are to expect in the *inſuing*.

CHAP.

Chap. III.

Exceptions to the third Chapter answered.

Sect. I.

The Diviſion of Schiſme juſtified. Of Schiſme againſt the authority of Councells. Of Unanimity of belief in the diſperſion of the Churches.

Num. 1. THe *exceptions* againſt the *third Chap:* are reducible to 4 heads. The *firſt* about the *inſufficiency* of the *diviſion* of *Schiſme*, in theſe words,

2. *In his third Chapter, what is chiefly to be noted to our purpoſe, is, that his diviſion is inſufficient, for he maketh Schiſm to be only againſt Monarchicall power, or againſt fraternall charity, which is very much beſides the principles of thoſe Proteſtants, who pretend ſo much to the authority of Councels, me thinks he ſhould have remembred there might be ſchiſme againſt conciliatory authority, whether this be called ſo when the Councell actually ſitteth, or in the unanimity of belief in the diſperſion of the Churches, ſo that the Doctor (ſuppoſing he concluded againſt the Pope) hath not concluded himſelf no ſchiſmatick, being ſeparated from the Catholick world.*

And again in the next page, by way of *recollection* or *ſecond* thoughts, thus,

But I muſt not forget here what I omitted to inſert before, that in his diviſion of Schiſme he omitteth the Principall, if not indeed, and in the uſe of the word by the Antients, the onely ſchiſm, which is when one breaketh from the whole Church of God: for though a breach made from the immediate ſuperior, or a particular Church, may in ſome ſort, and in our ordinary manner of ſpeaking be called a ſchiſme, yet that by wich one breaketh away from the communion of the whole Church, is properly, and in a higher ſenſe called Schiſme, and is that out of which the preſent

question proceedeth, whereas other divisions, as long as both parts remain in communion with the Universall Church, are not properly schismes, but with a diminutive particle, so that in this division he left out that part which appertained to the question.

3. My *division* of *schism* is that which I could not conceive subject to the *exceptions* of any *rationall* man, of what perswasions soever; *schism* being a *breach* of *unity* and *communion*; as many sorts as were conceivable of *unity* and *communion*, so many, and no more, I set down of *schisme*, some as breaches of the *subordination* which *Christ* setled in his *Church*, others of *mutuall charity*, which he left among his *Disciples*.

4. For is it not evident, that *all* men in the world are either our *superiors*, or *inferiors*, or our *equals*? and can I break *communion* with any, as long as being an *inferior*, I live *regularly* under all my *superiors*, and *brotherly* with all my *equals*? There is certainly no place of *doubt* in this. When therefore in his second *period* here set down, he mentions it, as the *principall*, (and in the *Antients* use of the word) the *onely Schism*, when one *breaketh from the whole Church of God*, It is strange he should think that man was not comprised in either *member* of my *division*, when certainly he is guilty of *both*. For how can he *separate* from the *whole Church*, unlesse he *separate* both from his *superiors* and his *equals* too? And if he *separate* from *both*, then questionlesse he separates from *one*, and from more than *one* of them.

5. Was it possible for any care more *sollicitously* to have *prevented* this *exception*, than that which by me was used, when among the *branches* of *equality*, with which every one is obliged to preserve *unity* and *communion*, I reckoned up, not only the *believers* of the *same* Congregation, &c. but the severall *communities* of *Christian* men from *Parishes* and *Diœceses*, to *climes* of the *whole Christian world*, *Chap.* 3. §. 5. And indeed it is a great piece of *austerity*, that when I have indevoured to prove that we of the *Church* of *England* have not *voluntarily separated* (and that onely is the *crime* of *Schism*) from any *one* particular *Church*, and no *one* of those proofs is *invalidated*, nor as yet so much as *excepted* against, it should yet

yet be thought seasonable to *reply*, that we have *broken off from the whole Church of God.*

6. Is not that *whole* made up of these *severals*, as a *body* of *limbs*, the *universal* of *particulars*? And can the *hand* be broken off from the whole *body*, when it is not *broken* off, but remains in perfect *union* with every part of the *body*? If the *arm* be *broken* from the *body*, the *hand*, which remains *united* to the *arm*, may yet be *separate* from the *whole body*, because by being *fastned* to the *arm* 'tis *united* but to *one*, and not to *all* the members of the *body*. But an *union* to *all* the members of the *body* supposes a *separation* from no one part that remains in the *body*, and sure that must be an *union* with the *whole* body, which is nothing else, but *all* the *members* together.

7. And so as his *second thoughts* were *effects*, not *remedies* of his *forgetfulness*, the very same, which he had mentioned before under the style of *separation from the Catholick world*, so certainly they were again *effects* of his *inobservance*, that his *principall* sort of *schisme*, *separation* from the *whole Church*, was comprehended by me under this style, *separation from the severall communities of the whole Christian world.*

8. As to the former branch of his exception, that in my *division* of *schisme*, into that which is against *Monarchical* (I said, and when he recites my words, he should doe so too, *paternal*) *power*, and that which is against *fraternall charity*, *I omit to mention the authority of Councels*, It is evidently a *causelesse* suggestion. For 1. if *Councels*, as he saith, have any *authority*, that will certainly be reducible to *paternal* power. And if they have *none*, any farther than by way of *counsell* and *advice*, that will directly fall under the head of *fraternall* charity.

9. *Secondly*, If by *Councels* he mean *Provinciall Councels*, it is evident that the power which severally belongs to the *Bishops* of each *Province*, is united in that of a *Provinciall Councell*, where all the *Diocesan Bishops* are assembled, and the despising of that is an offence under the *first* sort of *schisme*, a *breach* of the *subordination* to the *Bishop*, yea, and the *Metropolitan* too, who presides in the *Provinciall Councell.*

10. So again, if he mean *National Councells*, the power of the *Bishops*,

Bishops of all the *Provinces* there assembled, divolves upon this *assembly*, compounded of all of them, the *despising* thereof is the *despising* of these *Ecclesiasticall superiours* of the whole *nation*, and culpable, and *schismaticall* upon that account.

11. As for *Oecumenicall* or *Generall Councells*, if they be truly such, the power of *all* the *Bishops* of *all* the *Provinces* in all *Christian* nations divolves upon that, and so cannot be *despised* without *despising* of all ranks of our *Ecclesiasticall superiors*, *Bishops*, *Metropolitans*, *Primates* or *Patriarchs*, and therefore this sort of *schisme* could not be deemed to be omitted, where all those other branches, of which it is made up, were so *particularly* handled.

12. That any more *speciall* consideration was not taken of *Generall Councells* in that discourse, the account (beside that which is now given) is more than intimated in that *Tract* of *Schism*, pag. 60. first becaus they were *remedies* of *schisme*, and *extraordinary*, not any standing *Judicatures*, to which our *constant subordination* and *subjection* was required. 2. Becaus these were such, as without which the *Church* continued for the first 300 years, and so could not belong to a *generall* discourse, which spake of all the *certain* and *ordinary* and *constant* sorts of *schisme*, and such as *all* times were capable of, and inlarged not to those other of *accidentall emergencies*. 3. Becaus they are now *morally* impossible to be had, the *Christian* world being under so many *Empires*, and divided into so many *communions*, that it is not visible to the eye of man how they should be *regularly* assembled.

13. As for those that are already *past*, and are on due grounds to be acknowledged truly *Oecumenicall*, the *communion*, which is possible to be had or broken with them, is that of *compliance* with, or *recession* from their *definitions*, and our *innocence* in that respect is avowed, p. 160. as the congregating of the like (when *possible*, and *probable* toward the end) is recommended, p. 158. as a *supply*, when there should be need of *extraordinary* remedies.

14. *Lastly*, If none of this had been done, or if this had not been undertaken so solemnly and *formally*, as some other supposed

ſuppoſed branches of *ſchiſm* were, in that *Tract*, yet the account of that is viſible to any, becauſe the *principal* ſort of *ſchiſme* charged by the *Romaniſt* on the *Church* of *England* is that of caſting out the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, not contemning the *authority* of *Councels*, and therefore I was in reaſon to apply my diſcourſe moſt *largely* and particularly to that head, to which their *objections*, not my own *choice* directed me. So evidently contrary to the notoriety of the fact is this *complaint* of this *Gentleman*, that my *diviſion* of *ſchiſm* was *inſufficient*, and that I took no *notice* of this (as he pleaſes to call it) *conciliatory authority*.

15. That to make his ſuggeſtion ſeem more *probable*, he *adviſedly* choſe to *change* the tearms of my *diviſion* from that which was againſt *Paternal*, to that which is againſt *Monarchical* power, upon this apprehenſion, that *Paternal* power would viſibly include that of the *Fathers* in *Councel* aſſembled, as well as in *ſeveral* ; but *Monarchical* power could not ſo fitly bear it, I ſhall not enter into his *ſecrets* to divine. This I am ſure of, that the *unanimity* of *belief* in the *diſperſion* of the *Churches*, cannot with any propriety (as by him it is) be defined a *branch* of *Conciliatory authority*, for certainly the *Churches diſperſed* are not *met* together, the διασπορὰ or *diſperſion* of the *Jewes* differed much from the *Councel* aſſembled at *Jeruſalem*, and the *Chriſtian Church* at this day is without queſtion no *Oecumenical Councel*.

16. And then what *authority ſcattered* members can have, which never legally *command*, or *exerciſe authority*, but when they are in *conjunction*, I ſhall not here make ſtay to demonſtrate: whatſoever there is of this nature will moſt properly be compriſed under the *head* of *communion* or *unity Fraternal*, and the *ſchiſme* which is a *tranſgreſſion* of that, being at large handled alſo, *Chap.* 8, 9, 10. there was no inſufficiency, in any *juſtice*, to be charged on this *diviſion*.

Sect. II.

Of the extent of the Roman Province. The Bishops of Italy *distinct from those that belong to* Rome. *The Ecclesiastical distributions agreeable with the Civil.* Ruffinus *vindicated.*

Num. 1. THe second charge on this Chapter is about the *extent* of the *Roman Patriarchie*, in these words:

2. *In this Chap: he telleth us many things, some true, some not so, but all either common to us both, or not appertaining to the controversie, untill he concludes, that certainly the Roman Patriarchie did not extend it self to all* Italy, *and this he does out of a word in* Ruffinus, *which he supposeth to be taken in a speciall propriety of law, whereas indeed that author's knowledge in Grammar was not such as should necessarily exact any such belief, especially learned men saying the contrary.*

3. The place, to which this *exception* belongs, is not set down by this *Gentleman*, but by annexing the testimony out of *Ruffinus*, I discern it to be that of pag. 52. where speaking of the *Picenum suburbicarium* and *Annonarium*, I say the former belonged to the *Præfecture* of *Rome*; the latter, with the *seven Provinces* in the *broader part* of *Italy*, belonged to the *Dioceſe* (as it was antiently called) of *Italy*, of which *Milan* was the *Metropolis*.

4. This being the *affirmation* which he excepteth against, I did not, nor yet doe make any *question* of *vindicating*, and defending it against any *objection*.

5. That *learned men say the contrary*, is here suggested, in the close, but as there is not one *learned* man named, nor *testimony* produced (which therefore amounts no higher than the bare opinion or affirmation of this one *Gentleman*, without any one *reason* or *authority* to support it) so when any such *learned* mens names and *testimonies* shall be produced, it will be easie to shew, that there is very little of their *learning* expreſt in so saying.

6. On the other side I had (pag. 50. in the *margent*) referred to some *testimonies* whereon my *assertion* was founded, *viz:* those which manifestly distinguisht the *Province* of the *Bishop*

of

of *Rome* from the *Province* of *Italy*, which could not have had truth in them, if the *Province* of the *Patriarch* of *Rome* extended to *all Italy*.

7. Such was that of * *Eusebius* distinctly mentioning the *Bishops* of the *Cities* of *Italy*, and the *Bishops* that belong to the *City* of the *Romans*. The *testimony* out of the *Edict* of the *Emperor Aurelian*, in the controversie betwixt *Paulus Samosatenus* and *Domnus*, where it is decreed, that the *house*, about which they contended, should be delivered οἷς ἂν οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν καὶ τὴν Ῥωμαίων πόλιν ἐπίσκοποι * τῷ δόγματι διελοιεν, *to those to whom the Bishops through* Italy *and the City of the Romans should decree it*. * l. 7. c. 1. * γρ: διὰ

8. The like was that of the *Councel* of *Sardice* set down in * *Athanasius* in the *title* of their *Epistle* to the *Alexandrians*, Thus, Ἡ ἁγία Σύνοδος ἡ κατὰ θεὸν χάριν ἐν Σαρδικῇ συναχθεῖσα ἀπὸ Ῥωμῆς καὶ Ἀπανίων, Γαλλίων, Ἰταλίας, &c. *The holy Synod by God's grace assembled at* Sardice, *from* Rome, *and* Spain, France, Italy, *&c.* * *Apoll: 2. ad Imp: Const: Edit: Par: Tom:* 1. p. 756.

9. So in * *Athanasius*'s declaration of his own affairs, and the (συμφωνία) *agreement* of many *Bishops* with him, he specifies, who and how many they were, πλείους δὲ ἦσαν ὧν ἄπωθεν τῆς μεγάλης Ῥώμης καὶ τῆς Ἰταλίας πάσης, Καλαβρείας τε, &c. *There were more than four hundred both from great* Rome, *and from all* Italy, *and from* Calabria, &c. Where the *Bishops* of the *Roman Province* are distinguisht from the *Bishops* of *Italy*, as those again from the *Bishops* of *Calabria*, &c. * Ἐπιστ: τοῖς μονήρη βίον ἀσκοῦσι, *Paris: Ed:* t. 1. p. 827. C.

10. So among the names prefixt to the * first *Councel* of *Arles*, we have *ex provinciâ Italiæ, civitate Mediolanensi*, &c. *ex urbe Româ, quos Sylvester Episcopus misit ex Provinciâ Romanâ, civitate Portuensi, &c. of the Province of* Italy, *from the city of* Milan *&c. from the city of* Rome *those whom Bishop* Sylvester *sent, of the Province of* Rome, *from the City of* Porta *&c.* such and such were assembled at that *Councel*, where again the matter is clear as to the *distinction* of those *Provinces* of *Rome* and *Italy*, the former under the *presidency* of the *Bishop* of *Rome*, the later of the *Bishop* of *Milan*. * *Concil: tom:* 1. p. 266.

11. By this it might have appeared to this *Gentleman* (if as he pleased to mention the *much Greek*, in his *Preface*, so he had

been at leisure to consider the *importance* of it) that beside the *testimony* (which he will call *a word*) of *Ruffinus*, I had made use of other waies of *proof*, that the *presidency* of the *Bishop* of *Rome* (I suppose that he must mean by the *Roman Patriarchie*) did not extend it self to *all Italy*.

12. Again after the *testimony* of *Ruffinus*, I mentioned another evidence, from the *proportioning Ecclesiastical jurisdictions to the Temporal of the Lieutenants*; This may appear *in thesi*, by the words of * *Origen*, of which I shall now, because I did not there, take notice, ὅτῳ δὲ καὶ ἄρχοντα ἐκκλησίας ἑκάστης πόλεως ἄρχοντι τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει συγκριτέον, *It is fit that the Prefect of the Church of each City, should correspond to the Governour of those which are in the City*. And that so it was, appears by the *second Canon* of the *Councel* of *Constantinople*, where the *jurisdictions* of the *Bishops* are still proportioned to the *condition* of the *Cities* where they were, the *Bishop* of *Alexandria* to have *power* over all *Ægypt*, the *Metropolis* whereof was *Alexandria*, and so in the rest. And this is in the *Tract* of *Schism* largely deduced and cleared also, p. 54,55, &c. and need not be here again *repeated*, And so here was more again than the word of *Ruffinus*, for what I said.

* *Cont: Cels:* l.3.

13. *Lastly*, that for which *Ruffinus* was cited, being but this, that the *Bishop of* Rome *was authorized by the* Nicene *Canon to take care of the suburbicarian regions*, I could not sure be mistaken in thinking, that he took the word *suburbicarian* in such a *propriety* (I say not of *law*, but) of *common language*, as will conclude the *Picenum suburbicarium* to belong to the *Roman Prefecture*, as the *Annonarium* did to the *Diocese* of *Italy*.

14. And certainly *Ruffinus*, that lived so neer after the *Councel* of *Nice*, and that in *Italy*, a *Presbyter* of *Aquileia*, knew how that was distributed in his time, better than this *Gentleman* at this distance can pretend to doe, may also be allowed to know so much of *Grammar*, as to expresse his own sense (in a *Paraphrase*) of that *Nicene Canon*.

15. In a matter so clear I shall adde no more, but the words of a most *excellent person*, *Jac: Leschasserius* in his *Consultatio ad Claris: Venet: Ruffino bellum indicunt scriptores Romani hujus temporis*,

temporis, &c. *The Romanists of this time are displeased with* Ruffinus, *not knowing what Churches they were, which the Nicene Canon understands to be under the first and ordinary power of the Pope. Whereas* Ruffinus *understood it of the Churches of the suburbicarian Provinces and regions, which are four, the first the Roman, with the bounds of the Prefecture of the City, and three other with which that is incompast, All Campania, Picenum suburbicarium, and Tuscia suburbicaria*, of which there is frequent mention in the *Notitiæ* of the *Roman Empire*. And of this the same *Authour* hath written a *learned Tract*, And so here is a distinct *testimony* of a very *learned* man, and this is a sufficient *answer* to his bare indefinite *affirmation* that *learned men say the contrary*.

Sect. III.

The identity of the office of Primates and Patriarchs, the authorities of Gratian, *and* Anacletus, *and* Anicetus.

Num. 1. THe third *charge* wherein this third *Chapter* is concerned, remains about the *identity* of the *office* of *Primates*, and *Potriarchs*, in these words:

2. *Then he telleth you that the office of Primates and Patriarchs was the same, onely authorising that affirmation from an Epistle of* Anacletus, *the which, as soon as occasion serveth, he will tell you is of no authority, but fictitious.* He urgeth Gratian too.

3. What I said of *Primates* and *Patriarchs*, that though the *Patriarchs* had the *precedence*, in *Councels*, the deference in respect of *place*, yet the *power* and *jurisdiction* of *Primates* was as great as of *Patriarchs*, and the *office* the same, I thought had sufficiently been evidenced to the *Romanist* p. 58. For as one manifest indication of it was there mentioned, *viz:* that in Authors the very *titles* are confounded, witness *Justinian* who commonly gives *Primates* the name of *Patriarchs* of the *Dioceses*, so the reference to those two authorities so acknowledged and owned by the *Romanists*, the *Epistle* of *Anacletus*, and the *Decree* of *Gratian*, seemed to me to put it out of all *question*.

4. For in the *body* of their *Canon Law corrected* and set out by *Pope Gregory* XIII. as *Gratian's decree* makes up the first and principall part. so in that, *par: 1. distinct:* 99. we have these words, *De Primatibus autem quaritur quem gradum in Ecclesiâ tenuerint, an in aliquo à Patriarchis differant, The question is made concerning Primates, what degree they have in the Church, and whether in any thing they differ from Patriarchs.* And the answer is, *Primates & Patriarchæ diversorum sunt nominum, sed ejusdem officii, Primates and Patriarchs are of different name, but of the same office.*

5. What could have been said more *punctually* and expresly to the business in hand? What more *authentick* and dilucid *testimony* could have been produced to any *Romanist*, with whom I had to doe? And 'tis a little strange, that this *Gentleman* should say that I *onely authorize my affirmation from an Epistle of Anacletus*, and then either he, or some Supervisor for him, put in as a *marginal* note, *He urgeth Gratian too*, When 1. if I urged *Gratian*, I did not urge *Anacletus onely*; and 2. it is evident I did urge *Gratian* as punctually as *Anacletus*, and 3. *Gratian's* words are so *expresse* as nothing can be more, and 4. *Gratian's authority* with them is as great as any could have been produced; and 5. there is not one word offered to avoid the *force* of *Gratian's* testimony, as to that other of *Anacletus* there is, which argues that this *Gentleman* was concluded by *Gratian*, yet would not *consent* to the proposition unanswerably inferred from him. And this may suffice to be noted concerning that *testimony*.

6. Then for *Anacletus* 1. his words are these, *Provinciarum divisio ab Apostolis est renovata, The division of Provinces was renued by the Apostles, Et in capite Provinciarum— Patriarchas vel Primates, qui unam formam tenent, licèt diversa sint nomine, leges divinæ & Ecclesiasticæ poni & esse jusserunt, ad quos Episcopi, si necesse fuerit, confugerent, eosque appellarent, And in the head of the Province— Patriarchs, or Primates, who hold the same form* (are of the same *nature*) *though they be divers names, are placed by divine and Ecclesiasticall laws, so that to them the Bishops, when 'tis needfull, may resort and make their appeals.* This testimony again as punctuall to the purpose as could have been devised. And

7. And then *secondly*, this being by the *Romanists* received as a *Decretall Epistle* of that *Pope* and *antient Bishop* of *Rome*, was in reason, whatsoever it were to us, to stand with the *Romanist* in full authority.

8. *Thirdly*, This being in perfect *concord* with the *decree* of *Gratian*, is in the aforesaid *body* of their *Canon law* approved, and set out by *Pope Gregory* XIII. annext to that *decree* of *Gratian*, *Distinct:* 99. c. 1.

9. And *fourthly*, whereas this *Gentleman* saith, that *as soon as occasion serves I will tell you* this *Epistle* of *Anacletus* is of *no authority*, I must say 1. that I have no where, that I remember, ever said so. 2. That this *Gentleman* cannot without *divining* tell me now, what I *shall* doe hereafter. 3. That *occasion* not yet requiring it of me, but *Anacletus* affirming what I affirm, I have no *temptation* to doe so, and so as yet he can have no pretence to make use of this subterfuge. 4. That there are things called *argumenta ad homines*, *arguments* that may binde *him* who acknowledges the *authority*, from which they are drawn, though they conclude not *him* that allows not those *authorities*, and such is this of *Anacletus* his *Epistle*, to a *Romanist*.

10. And by the same *Logick* that he can inferre that *Anacletus's authority* was unduely produced by me, who (as he but thinks) will not *stand* to *Anacletus's authority*, I may sure conclude that *Anacletus's authority* was duly produced by me, because against him, who, I have reason to presume, must *stand* to *Anacletus's authority*.

11. A *third testimony* of the same nature I shall now adde, which must again have force with a *Romanist*, that of *Anicetus ad Episcopos Galliæ*, which follows there in the * *Corpus Juris Canonici. Primarum civitatum Episcopos Apostoli & successores Apostolorum regulariter Patriarchas & Primates esse constituerunt. The Apostles and their successors regularly appointed that the Bishops of the Prime Cities should be Primates and Patriarchs.* And till somewhat be produced to the contrary, as 'tis sure here is nothing offered by this *Gentleman*, this may at the present suffice in this place. * *Decret: Grat: par: 1. dist: 92. c. 2.*

Sect.

Sect. IV.

The ſupreme Eccleſiaſticall power of Patriarchs. The power of convoking Councells, a prerogative of Supremacy. That the Biſhop of Rome *is not over Patriarchs. Proofs from the Councells, and Canons Apoſtolick. and the* Corpus Juris, *and Pope* Gregory *s arguing.*

Num. 1. THe laſt exception concerns the *ſupreme Power* of *Patriarchs*, or the no *ſuperiority* of any *Eccleſiaſticall power* over them, Thus.

2. *Then he ſaith there was no power over the Patriarchs, his proof is becauſe the Emperour uſed his ſecular authority in gathering of Councels, concluding, that becauſe the Pope did not gather general Councels, therefore he had no authority over the Univerſal Church, which how unconſequent that is, I leave to your judgment.*

3. That there was no *ſupreme power* in the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, nor in any other above that of *Primates* and *Patriarchs*, but onely that of the *Emperour* in the whole *Chriſtian* world, as of every *ſoveraign Prince* in his *dominions*, I thought ſufficiently proved by this, that the *power* of *convoking Councels* did not belong to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, but to the *Prince* in every *nation*, and the *Emperour* in the *whole* world. And I deemed this a ſufficient proof, not becauſe there are no other branches of a *ſupreme authority* imaginable, or which are claimed by the *Biſhop* of *Rome* ſave onely this; but 1. becauſe this of *convoking Councels* is certainly *one* ſuch prerogative of the *ſupreme* power, *inſeparable* from it, and he that hath not that, hath not the *ſupreme* power (as in any *nation* ſome *prerogatives* there are, which alwaies are annext to the *Imperial Majeſty*, and wherever any one of them truely is, there is the *ſupreme* power, and 'tis *treaſon* for any but the *ſupreme*, to aſſume any one of them, and one of that number is calling of *national Aſſemblies*) And *ſecondly*, becauſe the *Biſhop* of *Rome* doth as avowedly challenge this power of *convoking General Councels*, as any other I could have named or inſiſted on. And truely that was the onely reaſon why I ſpecified in this,

this, becauſe this of all others is moſt *eminent* in it ſelf, moſt *characteriſtical* of the *ſupreme power*, and moſt *challenged* by the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, and moſt due to him, in caſe he be the *Univerſal Paſtor*.

4. And then where there be *ſeveral* branches of a *power*, all reſident in the ſame ſubject *inſeparably*, from the *abſence* of one to collect the *abſence* of all, I muſt ſtill think, a *ſolid* way of *probation*, and cannot diſcern the *infirm* part, or *inconſequence* of it. If I could, it would be no difficult matter to *repair* it, and ſupply the *imperfectneſſe* of the proof, by what is put together in the *Corpus Juris Canonici* (even now cited) *Decret: par:* 1. *diſt:* 99. c. 3,4,5.

5. The thing that I had to prove, was, that there was not antiently any *ſummum genus*, any *ſupreme* either of, or over *Patriarchs*, beſide the *Prince* or *Emperour*. To this, as farre as concerns the *negative* part, that the *Biſhop* of *Rome* is not this *ſummum genus*, I now cite from that third Chap. *Primæ ſedis Epiſcopus non appelletur Princeps ſacerdotum, vel ſummus ſacerdos, The Biſhop of the firſt ſeat ought not to be called Prince of the Prieſts, or ſupreme Prieſt.* And this teſtified out of the *African Councel, Can:* 6. where the very words are recited with this addition of [*aut aliquid hujuſmodi*] he is not to be called by any *other title* of the *ſame kinde, ſed tantum primæ ſedis Epiſcopus, but onely Biſhop of the firſt See*, and there were three ſuch at that time, (thoſe named in the *Nicene Canon*) *Alexandria, Rome, Antioch*, as is ſufficiently known.

6. And that he may ſee the *practice* of the *Church* was perfectly concordant with that *definition*, I referre this *Gentleman* to the *Milevitan Councell, cap.* 22. where ſpeaking of *appeals* from their *Biſhops*, the rule is, *non provocent niſi ad Africana concilia, vel ad Primates Provinciarum ſuarum, They muſt appeal to none but the African Councels, or the Primates of their own Provinces. Ad tranſmarina autem qui putaverint appellandum, à nullo intra Africam in communionem recipiantur. But if any ſhall think fit to appeal to any tranſmarine* (forreign) judicature, *they are not to be admitted to communion by any within Africa.*

7. And indeed the ſame had been before *defined* by the *firſt*

Nicene Councel, c. 5. where the sentence pronounced against any by the *Bishops* in each *Province* was to stand good according to the *Canon* (I suppose the 12 *Apostolick*) which pronounces τὰς ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἀποβληθείσας, ὑφ' ἑτέρων μὴ παρεῖσθαι, that *they which are excommunicated by some, shall not be received by others*. And accordingly in the *Synodical Epistle* of the *African Councel* to *Pope Celestine*, which is in the Book of *Canons* of the *Roman Church*, and in the *Greek* collection of the *Canons* of the *African Church*, we finde these words, ἐκελεύομεν, ἵνα τὰ λοιπὰ πρὸς τὰς ὑμετέρας ἀκοὰς, τὰς ἐντεῦθεν παραγινομένους εὐχερῶς μὴ προσδέχησθε, μηδὲ τοὺς παρ' ἡμῶν ἀποκοινωνητοὺς εἰς κοινωνίαν τὴν λοιπὴν θελήσαιν δέξασθαι, ἐπειδὴ τοῦτο καὶ τῇ ἐν Νικαίᾳ Συνόδῳ δεδοκὲν εὐχερῶς εὑρεῖν ἔστι σεβασμιότητι, *We intreat you* (the style of one *Church* to another) *that for the future you will not easily admit those who have come to you from hence, and that you will not receive to your communion those who are excommunicate by us, seeing the Councell of* Nice *hath thus defined, as you may easily discern.*

8. By all which put together by the *African* out of the *Nicene*, and by the *Nicene* out of the *Apostolick Canon*, it is evident that the *Bishop* of *Rome* hath not power to *absolve* any person *excommunicate* by any *Bishop* of another *Province*, and that 'tis unlawfull for any such to make *appeal* to him, which certainly will conclude against every the most inferior branch of his pretended *authority* over the *Universal Church*.

9. If this be not enough, then adde the 34 *Apostolick Canon*, τοὺς ἐπισκόπους ἑκάστου ἔθνους εἰδέναι χρὴ τὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς πρῶτον καὶ ἡγεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ὡς κεφαλὴν. *The Bishops of every nation must know him that is the first among them*, i.e. their *Primate, and account him as their head*. Which sure inferres that the *Bishop* of *Rome* is not the one onely *head* of all *Bishops*. The same is afterward transcribed by the 9 *Canon* of *Antioch*.

10. But to return to their *Corpus Juris*, so again *Decret: par: 1. dist: 99. c. 4. Nec etiam Romanus Pontifex universalis est appellandus. The Pope of* Rome *is not to be called Universal Bishop*, citing the *Epistle* of *Pope Pelagius* II. *Nullus Patriarcharum Universalitatis vocabulo unquam utatur, quia si unus Patriarcha universalis dicatur, Patriarcharum nomen cæteris derogatur.*

derogatur. No Patriarch must ever use the title of Universal, for if one be called universal Patriarch, the name of Patriarch is taken from all the rest, And more to the same purpose; the very thing that I was here to prove.

11. So again Ch. 5. out of the *Epistle* of *Pope Gregory* to *Eulogius Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, where refusing the title of *Universalis Papa, Universal Pope*, or *Father*, or *Patriarch*, and calling it *superbæ appellationis verbum*, a *proud title*, he addes, *si enim Universalem me Papam vestra Sanctitas dicit, negat se hoc esse, quod me fatetur Universum, If the Patriarch of* Alexandria *call the Pope universal Father*, he doth thereby *deny himself to be that which he affirms* the *Pope* to be *universally*; The meaning is clear, If the *Pope* be *universal Patriarch*, then is he *Patriarch* of *Ægypt*, for sure that is a part of the *Universe*; and then as there cannot be *two supremes*, so the *Bishop* of *Alexandria* cannot be *Patriarch* of *Ægypt*, which yet from S. *Mark*'s time was generally resolved to belong to him, and the words of the *Nicene Canon* are expresse to it, that according to the ἀρχαία ἔθη *original, Primitive customes*, the *Bishop* of *Alexandria* should have power over all *Ægypt*, *Lybia*, and *Pentapolis*, adding ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥωμῇ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο συνηθές ἐστιν, &c. *seeing this is also customary with the Bishop of* Rome, *of* Antioch, &c. τὰ πρεσβεῖα σώζεσθαι ἐκκλησίαις, *that the privileges should be preserved to the Churches.*

12. All which arguing of that *Pope*, yea, and that *great Councel* were perfectly unconcluding (*inconsequent*, as mine was said to be) if the *Bishop* of *Rome*, or any other, had power over *Patriarchs*, or *authority* over the *universal Church*, which here this *Gentleman* is pleased to affirm, and so sure must think *Gregory* more than *fallible*, when he thus *protested*, and *disputed* the contrary.

13. How much higher than this the same *Gregory* ascended in expressing his detestation of that *title*, is sufficiently known from his *Epistle* to *Mauritius* the *Emperor*, *In regist:* l. 4. *Ep:* 30. I shall not here trouble him with the recitation of it.

14. What is after these passages set down in their *body* of the *Law*, shews indeed that the *Popes* continued not alwaies of

this minde, Neither was I of opinion that they did, the *story* being known to all how *Boniface* III. with much adoe obtained of *Phocas* the *Emperour* an *Edict* for the *Primacy* and *Universal jurisdiction* of the *Church* of *Rome* (see *Paul: Diac: de Gestis Romanorum*, l. 18.) which yet is an argument that till then it had no *foundation*.

15. Whether there were antiently any such, higher than *Patriarchs*, and whether now there ought to be, was the *question* before me, and both those I must think *concluded* by what I have here set down, as farre as relates to any true, i.e. *original* right, from any *appointment* of *Christ*, or title of *succession* to S. *Peter*.

16. Much more might be easily added to this head, if it were not evident that this is much more than was *necessary* to be replied to a bare suggestion, without any specifying what that *power* is, which *may* belong to the *Pope* over the *Universal Church*, though convoking of *Councels* did *not* belong to him, and without any offer of *proof*, that any such did *really* belong to him.

CHAP.

Chap. IV.

An Answer to the Exceptions made to the fourth Chapter.

Sect. I.

The Romanists pretensions founded in S. Peters *universal Pastorship. Of Possession without debating of Right. What Power the Pope was possest of here.*

Num. 1. IN the *fourth Chap:* his objections begin to grow to some *height*, they are reducible to *three heads*, the first is by way of *Preface*, a charge of a very considerable *default* in the whole *discourse* that I *remember not what matters I handle*; the other *two* are refutations of the *two* evidences I use to disprove the *Popes* claim of *universal Primacie* from *Christ's donation* to S. *Peter*.

2. The first of the three is set down in these words:

In the fourth Chapter he pretendeth to examine whether by Christ his donation S. Peter *had a Primacie over the Church, where not to reflect upon his curious division, I cannot omit that he remembers not what matters he handles, when he thinketh the Catholick ought to prove that his Church or Pope hath an universal Primacie; for it being granted that in* England, *the Pope was in quiet possession of such a Primacie, the proof that it was just belongeth not to us, more than to any King, who received his Kingdome from his Ancestors, time out of minde, to prove his pretension to the Crown just: for quiet possession of it self is a proof, untill the contrary be convinced, as who should rebell against such a King were a Rebell, untill he shewed sufficient cause for quitting obedience; with this difference, that obedience to a King may by prescription or bargain be made unnecessary, but if Christ hath commanded obedience to his Church, no length of years, nor change of humane affairs can ever quit us from this duty of obedience, so that the charge of proving the Pope to have*

no such authority from Christ, lieth upon the Protestants now as freshly, as the first day of the breach, and will doe so untill the very last.

3. My *method* in the beginning of *Chap:* 4. is visibly this; The *Church* of *England* being by the *Romanist* charged of *schism* in departing from the *obedience* of the *Bishop* of *Rome*, and this upon *pretense* that he, as *successor* of S. *Peter* hath a *supremacy* over *all* the *Churches* in the world, I undertake to examine the truth of two branches of this *suggestion*, one whether Saint *Peter* had this *universal Supremacy* given him by *Christ*; the *second*, whether this *power*, if supposed to be *instated* on Saint *Peter*, devolved on the *Bishops* of *Rome*. The former of these I examined in that *Chapter*. And I must now discern, if I can, how I have failed in any particle of my undertaking.

4. First, saith he, he will not reflect on my *curious division*. And I that know there was no *curiosity* in any *division* of mine, but on the other side, such *perspicuity* as was agreeable to a desire and indevour to set down the whole matter of debate between us as *distinctly* and *intelligibly* as I could, that the *Reader* might be sure to judge whether I answered their charge, or no, I have no reason in the least to suspect the *fitnesse* and *usefulnesse* of my *division*, nor consequently to be impertinently *sollicitous* in *reflecting* on it.

5. That which he saith he *cannot omit*, I shall make haste to consider with him, *viz:* my great *mistake*, in *thinking the Catholick ought to prove his Church or Pope hath an universal Primacie.*

6. To this I answer, 1. that there is no manner of *foundation* or pretense for this *exception* here. For I no where say the least word toward this purpose of *requiring* the *Romanist* to *prove* his pretensions, or to prove them by this *medium*, Onely I take it for granted, that he doth actually produce *arguments* to inferre the *Pope's universal Primacie*, and that *Christ's donation* to S. *Peter* is one of those *arguments*. And that I was not herein mistaken, I shall, instead of a larger deduction of evidences from all sorts of *Romish writers*, make my appeal to the *objecter* himself, in several places of this little tract,

tract, *particularly* p.20. where he hath theſe words, *we relie on the firſt, as the foundation, and corner-ſtone of the whole building*, And what that *firſt* is, appears by the words immediately *precedent*, that the *pretenſions for the Pope's ſupremacy in* England *muſt be founded as ſucceſſor to S.* Peter *in the univerſal Paſtorſhip of the Church*, ſo including *England* as a member thereof. From whence in ſtead of *recriminating* and *retorting* on him the charge of the *ill memory*, I ſhall onely make this undeniable *inference*, that I was not miſtaken in thinking that the *Romaniſt* doth actually found his *pretenſions* in the *univerſal Paſtorſhip* of Saint *Peter*, and conſequently, If I prove that to fail, I have removed that which in his own ſtyle is the *foundation* and *corner ſtone* of his *whole building*.

7. But then 2. becauſe he here pretends that it belongs not to a *Romaniſt* to *prove his pretenſion juſt*, but that it ſufficeth that he hath the *poſſeſſion*, I deſire to propoſe theſe three things to his conſideration, 1. By demanding whether at *this* time, or for theſe 100 years the *Pope* hath had the *poſſeſſion* of the *obedience* of this *nation*; I ſuppoſe he will ſay he hath *not*; And if ſo, then by the force of his own argument, that *poſſeſſion*, and all the *arguments* deducible from thence, are now loſt to him, the *preſcription* being now on *our* ſide, as before on *theirs*, and there is nothing left him to plead, but the *original right* on his ſide, againſt the *violence* of the *ſucceeding poſſeſſion*: And if he come to the *pleading* of the *right*, then that is the very *method* that I propoſed, and ſo did not *offend* or *forget* my ſelf in ſo doing.

8. *Secondly*, Concerning their *poſſeſſion* before *Henry* VIII. his daies, I ſhall demand how *long* they had it, and *how* they acquired it; If he will not at all think fit to *anſwer* this *queſtion* in either part, then I confeſſe he hath made an end of the *diſpute*, and by refuſing to give account of the *right* he had to his *poſſeſſion*, he will leave every man to *catch* and hold what he can, and then to *imitate* him, and give no *account* to any how he came by it, which as it is an *unchriſtian* method, every man being obliged to clear his *actions* from manifeſt charges of *injuſtice* and *violence*, ſo again 'tis an *evil leſſon*

againſt

againſt himſelf, and unleſſe we will confeſſe our ſelves *Schiſmaticks* in *caſting* off their *obedience*, 'tis impoſſible for him ever to *prove* us ſuch, this kinde of *ſchiſm*, which now we ſpeak of, being by all acknowledged to be a *ſeparation* from our *lawfull ſuperiors*, and no way being imaginable to prove the *Pope* to be ſuch to this *nation*, without offering ſome proof to the point of *right*, as well as adhering to his *poſſeſſion*.

9. To which purpoſe it is farther obſervable, 1. That even in *ſecular* things it is not every *poſſeſſion* that gives a *right*, but 1. either the *bonæ fidei poſſeſſio*, a *poſſeſſion honeſtly* come by, or the *unjuſtneſſe* of whoſe *original* is not conteſted or made to *appear*. And 2. whatſoever *privilege* by *humane laws* belongs to *preſcription*, yet in *divine* or *Eccleſiaſticall* matters *preſcription* can be of no force againſt *truth* of *right*, and ſo this *Gentleman* ſeems to acknowledge here, extending the force of *poſſeſſion* no farther than till *ſufficient cauſe* be ſhewed to the *contrary*. 3. That though whilſt I am in *poſſeſſion* I need not be bound to *prove* my *right*, yet when I am *out* of *poſſeſſion*, there is not, beſide *abſolute force*, any way poſſible to recover a *poſſeſſion*, but this of *conteſting* and evidencing the *right* of it, and that, 'tis evident, is the *preſent* caſe.

10. But if he ſhall think fit to *anſwer* the *queſtion* in *either* part of it, then by the anſwer to the *firſt* part of it, he muſt be forced to ſet down the *original* of it; and by anſwer to the *ſecond*, the *right* of that *original* (and ſo he hath been fain to doe, as elſewhere, ſo in this very *paragraph*, where he ſpeaks of *Chriſt*'s commanding *obedience* to his *Church*, I ſuppoſe he muſt mean the *Church* of *Rome*) and that is again the very *method* in which I propoſed to debate, and conſider this *matter*.

11. *Thirdly*, For the *power*, of which the *Pope* was *poſſeſt* in this *Kingdome*, either it was no more than an *Eccleſiaſtical Primacie*, ſuch as by the *antient Canons* belongs to a *Primate* or *Patriarch* over *Metropolitans* and *Biſhops*, or elſe it was a *ſupreme power* over the *King* himſelf, whether in *Spiritual*, or alſo in *Temporal* affairs.

12. If it pretend onely to be the *former* of theſe, then the *power* of *Kings* to *erect* or *tranſlate Primacies* or *Patriarchates*, which

which is insisted on and evidenced in the *Tract* of *Schisme*, c 6. §. 9. was sufficient then to justifie what here was done, no *possession* being pleadable against the *King*, to restrain or exclude this *exercise* of his *power*, and so *now* to free us from *schisme*, (by this *Gentleman*'s rule) this act of the *Kings* in *translating* the *Primacie* being sufficient cause for quitting our *obedience*, supposing the *Bishop* of *Rome* formerly to have been our *Primate*.

13. But if the *pretensions* be higher, even for the *Supremacie* it self, either in *whole*, or in *part*, then 1. I may surely say they were never *bonæ fidei possessores* of that, And 2. that the *King*, who by being so, is *supreme* in his own *Kingdome*, and cannot admit of another *supreme* either in or out of it, hath all the advantages of *possession*, which are here spoken of by this *Gentleman*, and must not be divested of his *right*, nay *must* not, *cannot* (remaining a *King*) *divest* himself of it, nor might any without the *guilt* of *rebellion* quit his *obedience* to him.

14. *Lastly*, to remove all appearance of reason from this whole *exception*, 1. It is manifest that at the time of *casting* out the *power* of the *Pope* out of this *Kingdome*, there were (I must have leave to suppose, *convincing*) *reasons* given for the doing of it, A breviate of which the *Reader* may finde in that one *Treatise* (mentioned in the *Tract* of *Schism*, p. 135.) *De verâ differentiâ Regiæ & Ecclesiasticæ potestatis*, then composed and published by the *Bishops*, and since reprinted by *Melchior Goldastus* in *Monarchia*, *tom:* 3. p. 22. under the title of *opus eximium*, a very notable *excellent work*. 2. That how *meanly* so ever it hath been performed, yet this was one *special* design of the *Tract* of *Schism* (which this *Gentleman* saith will alwaies lie upon *Protestants*) to prove the *Pope* to have no such *authority* from *Christ*, as the *Romanist* pretendeth him to have. And this I hope may suffice to be said to his σκιαμαχία, his *prelusory skirmish* against this *fourth Chapter*.

Sect. II.

The condition of S. Peter's *Province. The Apostles distribution of their great Province, the World, into several portions.* Κλῆρος. Κλῆρος Ἀποστολῆς. Ὁ τόπος ὁ ἴδιος, Act. 1. *the interpretation thereof vindicated.*

Num. 1. I Proceed now to his refutations of the first *evidence* I make use of to *disprove* the *Pope's claim* to *universal Primacie* from *Christ's donation* to S. *Peter.*

2. My evidence is taken from the condition of S. *Peter's Province*, as by agreement betwixt him and his fellow *Apostle* S. *Paul*, it was assigned him, *Gal.* 2. 7,9. that he should be the *Apostle* of the *circumcision* or *Jewes* (which certainly was not the *whole* world) *exclusively* to the *Gentile* part, or the *uncircumcision*, which was remitted to S. *Paul* both there and *Rom.* 11.13. and this, as is * there specified, *in every city where they met together.* And because the *universal* extensive *commission* of *Christ* to all and every *Apostle*, giving them *authority* to *go* and *preach* to the *whole world*, might seem to be *contrary* to this *special* assignation, I took care to prevent this *objection*, by premising that this *commission* given by *Christ* indefinitely, and unlimitedly, and extending equally to the *whole* world, was restrained by some *subsequent* act or acts of the *Apostles* themselves, who distributed their *universal Province* into *several portions* and assignations, called κλῆρος ἀποστολῆς, *portions of Apostolacy*, and the several *Provinces* where they were thus to labour, styled each of them ὁ τόπος ὁ ἴδιος, to *each* an *assigned peculiar place*, Act. 1.25.

* *Of Schism*, p. 74.

3. Now to this *groundwork* of my insuing *probation*, he makes his first *exception* in these words:

Sect. 5. *As for his Proofs, which he calls Evidences, he telleth us first that S.* Peter *was the Apostle of the circumcision exclusively to the uncircumcision or Gentiles; To prove this, he saith the Apostles distributed their universal Province into several* κλῆρος ἀποστολῆς, *that is, by his interpretation, lesser Provinces, and citeth* Act. 1. v. 25. *where S.* Peter *with the other Apostles prayeth God to shew which of the two proposed he was pleased to have promoted*

moted to the dignity of being an Apoſtle, this they call κλῆρον ἀποστολῆς, *and this rigorous interpreter ſaith, it ſignifies the ſpecial Province S.* Matthias *was to have, though the Scripture it ſelf expreſſeth the contrary, ſaying the effect was that afterward he was counted amongſt the Apoſtles: Could any man not blinded with error make ſo wretched an interpretation? but he goes on preſently adding that S.* Peter *in the ſame place calleth theſe particular Provinces* τόπον ἴδιον, *and will you know what this* τόπος ἴδιος *or proper place is, read the Text, and you ſhall finde that S.* Peter *ſpeaketh of* Judas's *going to Hell to receive his eternall damnation: Methinks you ſhould wonder I can go on without aſtoniſhment at ſuch blaſphemous explications, for ſure it can be no leſſe ſo to abuſe the Word of God, and after this what doe you expect?*

4. Here are *two* great charges, the *firſt* introduced by ſtyling me a *rigorous interpreter*, and proſecuted, by affirming me *blinded with error*, my *interpretation wretched* and *contrary* to what the *Scripture expreſſeth*. But the *ſecond* is of no leſſe than *blaſphemy*, and *abuſing* the *Word* of *God*, and his friend is to *wonder* that he is not *aſtoniſhed*, and after I have been guilty of ſuch *crimes* as theſe, 'tis in *vain* forſooth to *expect* any thing from me, the whole inſuing diſcourſe is utterly *defamed* and blaſted, like * *Philopemen's* good *counſel* in the *Senate* of *Lacedæmon*, by being delivered by ſo *ill* a man, ſo *infamous* a perſon, as a *blaſphemer* is juſtly deemed by him. * *A. Gellius*, l. 18. c. 3.

5. But I am not to be *diſquieted* with this, or to prepare any reply to the *Rhetorical* paſſionate part of it, if the *interpretations* ſhall be found agreeable to *Scripture*, the *aſtoniſhment* and the *outcrie* will be ſoon at an end, And therefore that is the onely care that I ſhall here aſſume on me.

6. And 1. I ſhall ſuppoſe it evident from the *ſtory*, and from the very *end* to which this *commiſſionating* ſo great a number of *twelve Apoſtles* was deſigned, that all the *Apoſtles* were not to go *together*, in conſort, to preach unto *all* the *world*, It would have been long ere the *Faith* would have been propagated to *all* the *world*, if this *ſlower* method had been taken.

7. To this it is conſequent, that our *Saviour* having left the world in *common* before them, the diſtribution of that one

wider into ſeverall leſſer *Provinces* muſt be an *act* of the *Apoſtles* themſelves, as when *God* had given the *land* of *Canaan* to the 12 *tribes* of *Iſrael*, *Eleazar*, and *Joſua*, and the *heads* of the *Fathers* of the *tribes* diſtribute to every *tribe* their κλῆρος or *portion* (which becauſe it was to continue to their *poſterity*, we ordinarily ſtyle their *inheritance*) *Joſ.*14.1.

8. And as there is no doubt of the truth of this *fact*, ſo if this one thing be granted me, there is no more incumbent on me to *prove* in this matter; and though neither of thoſe *phraſes*, *Act.*1.25. ſhould be for my turn, yet my *concluſion* remains good to me, as farre as it pretendeth to be deducible from thoſe *phraſes*, viz: that the *Apoſtles* diſtributed their great *Province*, the *whole world*, into ſeverall *leſſer Provinces*, one, or poſſibly more than one to go *one* way, the other another.

9. It was therefore *ex abundanti*, more than was *neceſſary*, that I annexed the uſe of thoſe *phraſes* to that purpoſe, not undertaking to *prove* this (as this *Gentleman* ſaith) by thoſe *texts*, much leſſe *Peter's* being *Apoſtle* of the *circumciſion* (which was a *conſectary* and had its *ſeveral* probation afterwards) but onely *accommodating* thoſe *phraſes* to the matter in hand, and by the way *aſſigning* what I thought the moſt *probable* notion of them.

10. And although it be ſtill as unneceſſary to impoſe my *explications* on this *Gentleman*, the *concluſion* having as yet no *uſe* of them, yet being obliged to give him ſuch an *account* of my *actions*, as may free me from *blaſphemy*, and *abuſe* of the *Word* of *God*, I ſhall here adventure to make my *apologie*, by premiſing 1. not out of *Grammarians* onely, but out of the *Scripture* it ſelf, the notion of the word κλῆρος, which ſignifying *originally* a *lot* or way of *diviſion* (into *ſeverals*) of that, which belongs to all in *common* (one means of ſetling *propriety* among men) it comes next by an eaſie *figure* to ſignifie that which is thus *divided*, or which in the *diviſion* falls to every man as his *portion*.

11. So ſaith *Phavorinus* κληροῦται διαιρεῖται, and κλήρωσις, μερισμὸς, the *verb* ſignifies *diſtribution* both *active* and *paſſive*: and accordingly in the *ſon* of *Syrach* we have διαίρεσις κλήρου

diviſion

diviſion of, or, *by lot*, *Eccluſ.* 14 15. and by that we may underſtand a leſſe *obvious* expreſſion, c. 37.8. *beware of a counſeller*, &c. μήποτε βάλη ὅπῃ σοὶ κλῆρον, *leſt he caſt the lot upon thee*, i.e. leſt he help another to *cheat* thee, and then go *ſharer* with him, *divide* thee betwixt them.

12. So in like manner ſaith *Phavorinus* of the *ſubſtantive* κλῆρος, μέρος, λαχμὸς and μέρις, it ſignifies a *part*, that which falls to one's *lot*, a *portion*, As *Act.*8.21. μέρις and κλῆρος *portion* and *lot* are all one. And he that hath a *poſſeſſion* thus ſetled on him, and *dominion* by that means, or he that undertakes to dreſſe or till ſo much land, δεσπότης and γεωργὸς, the *Lord* and the *husbandman*, are both the *interpretation* of κληροῦχος, he that *hath* ſuch a *lot* or *portion* aſſigned him.

13. Proportionably thoſe that any *Governour* of the *Church* is ſet over, are called his κλῆρος or *lot*, and 1 *Pet.*5.3. ſuch *Governours* are commanded μὴ κατακυριεύειν τῶν κλήρων, not to behave themſelves as the *Roman Pretors* were wont to doe over their *ſeveral Provinces*, oppreſſing and *tyrannizing* over them.

14. To this it is agreeable, that κλῆρος διακονίας, *Act.* 1. 17. ſhould denote ſuch a *portion* of *miniſterial* office, as belonged to one that was ſent or *commiſſionated* by *Chriſt* πρὸς ἔργον *to a task* or *work*, expreſt v.20. by ἐπισκοπὴ αὐτοῦ *his Epiſcopal office* (for that though it be a *rule*, yet is alſo διακονία a *miniſterie*, *Mat.*23. 11.) in the *Church*.

15. Hence again that *portion* of *employment* in preaching the *Faith*, teſtifying the *reſurrection* of *Chriſt*, which belonged to one ſingle *Apoſtle*, ſuch as *Judas* was, and ἐξ ἧς παρέβη *from which he departed* by his *ſin*, and to which another *ſucceeds* by way of *ſurrogation*, is as fitly ſtyled κλῆρος Ἀποστολῆς *a portion of Apoſtolacy*, a μέρις or *diviſion* of that grand employment.

16. And what either one ſingle *error* or act of *blindneſſe* was committed in thus *interpreting*, much more *occœcation* or being *blinded with error*, which I ſuppoſe the compound *accumulation* (whether onely *ſin* or *puniſhment* alſo) of *many errors*, what *rigor* or *wretchedneſſe* of *interpretation*, I am ſtill ſo *blinde* as not to diſcern, and this *Gentleman* is not ſo *charitable*,

ritable, as to give me his leaſt *directions* to recover to my *way*, or my *eyes* again.

17. For as to the *Scriptures* expreſſing the *contrary*, in ſaying *he was counted among the Apoſtles*, that ſure is no evidence againſt my *interpretation*, for *Matthias* may become one of the *twelve*, ſucceed to *Judas*'s office and *lot*, that which did, or ſhould, if he had lived, have belonged to him, and yet neither he, if he had lived, nor now *Matthias* in his ſtead, have more than a *particular Province*, this or that *region*, (not the *whole world* in common) aſſigned for his *appartment*.

18. So that as yet I cannot diſcern that I have done the leaſt injury to the *text* in thinking κληρὸν ἀποστολῆς the *lot* or *diviſion of Apoſtolacy*, to be the *ſeveral* task that belonged to any of the *twelve Apoſtles*, or that *portion* of *labour*, that by conſent at their parting one from another ſhould be *aſſigned* to each of them.

19. And then the *analogie* will ſtill hold perfectly, that as this *diſtribution* of tasks conſiſted in going to ſeverall *quarters* for the *preaching* of the *faith* of *Chriſt*, one, one way; another, another; ſo he that had received his κληρὸς ἀποστολῆς *portion of Apoſtolacy*, ſhould be ſaid to have ἴδιον ἢ τόπον a *peculiar* or *proper place*, and having ſo, ſhould (not immediately, but ſoon after the *Holy Ghoſt*'s deſcent) πορευθῆναι εἰς αὐτόν, *go*, or, *betake himſelf to it*.

20. This therefore, and upon theſe grounds of *fitneſſe*, both in reſpect of the words, and the *context*, I take to be the meaning of that phraſe πορευθῆναι εἰς ἢ τόπον ἢ ἴδιον, *to go to his proper place*, his *peculiar* aſſignation, And I cannot imagine the leaſt inconvenience that can lie againſt this rendring.

21. For 1. in caſe it ſhould not be the *true*, yet it can be any thing as ſoon as *blaſphemy*, thus to interpret it. 'Tis certainly nothing to the *diſhonour* of *God*, to ſay that *Matthias* went and preacht the *Goſpel* in ſuch a *region* peculiarly, and ſo there is no *blaſphemie* in that, *viz:* the matter of the *interpretation*; and for the *abuſing* of the *Word* of *God*, it is hard to divine how that can be deemed ſuch, which affixeth nothing to the *Word* of *God*, but that which is *notoriouſly* true (for ſo it is that *Matthias* went one way to *preach* the *Goſpel*, and

S. *John*

S. *John* and S. *Bartholomew* each of them another) and would be acknowledged to doe ſo, if this *text* were not applied to it.

22. As for the other *interpretation* of the words (which this *Gentleman* is pleaſed to preferre, and might have injoyed his own judgment, without *cenſuring* them as *blaſphemers*, that differed from him in expounding one *difficult phraſe*) by affixing it to *Judas*, and not to *Matthias*, 1. there is no indication in the *context* that favours that, it was ſufficient to ſay of *Judas* that which had been ſaid v.16,17,18,19. to ſet out the *horror* of his fact, which ſoon attended it in his *own* breaſt, and the *bloody* death which it brought upon him, but he needed not proceed to *revealing* of *ſecrets*, the ſadder conſequents, which remained in arrear after death, and 'tis *Chryſoſtome*'s obſervation on v.16. *behold*, ſaith he, τὸ φιλόσοφον τῶ ἀνδρὸς, the *wiſe Chriſtian* carriage of S. *Peter*, πῶς οὐκ ὑβρίζει, ὐδὲ ἐνάλλεται, *how he doth not reproach, and inſult on him*, calling him μιαρὸν ἢ παμμιαρὸν, *villain, or deteſtable villain*, ἀλλ' ἁπλῶς τὸ γινόμενον δηλοῖ, *but ſets down the fact ſimply*, and on v. 16. περὶ τῆς παρούσης δίκης διαλέγεται, *he ſets down*, ſaith he, *his preſent vengeance*, that ſure is it which befell him in *this world*, which, by the way, cannot well conſiſt with the interpreting it of *hell*.

23. 2. The uſe of *Parentheſes* in *ſcripture* is very ordinary, and if that be here admitted (which it well may, without any more formal expreſſion of it, than by putting a *comma* after Ἰούδας, as it is already in the *printed* copies) then the interpretation is clear and unavoidable, to *receive the lot* or *portion of his Miniſterie and Apoſtleſhip (from which* Judas *by tranſgreſſion fell) to go*, or, *that he may go to his proper place*.

24. 3. *Hell* being the κοινὸς τόπος the *common place* or *lot* of all wicked men, it cannot fitly be expreſt with ſuch a double *emphaſis*, ὁ τόπος ὁ ἴδιος, *the place, the proper place*, i. e. the *place peculiar* to him, which yet may very fitly be affirmed of *Matthias* his *Province*, ſo *his*, as it was not any mans elſe.

25. *Laſtly*, It is not near ſo proper to ſay that he *ſinned* πορευθῆναι *to go to hell*, as that the other was *choſen* and *ſurrogated* into *Judas*'s *place* πορευθῆναι *to go* to *preach* to ſuch a *quarter*

of

of the *world*, or that the *Apostles* desired *God* to signifie his pleasure whom he had *chosen*, that so he might take his *portion* of *labour* and *go*; His *going* was visibly the *end* intended in all this, but *damnation* or punishment, *going to hell*, was never intended by *Judas* in his *transgression*, though it be supposed the deserved reward and *consequent* of it.

26. All this amassed together, may, I hope, vindicate an *innocent*, and, I hope, *obvious* (farre from *wrested*) interpretation from such an *accumulation* of charge, as is laid upon it, without any tender of reason against it, but the ὦ καλάσγλε, *O wretched* (*blasphemous* &c.) in *Lucian*. And so much in answer to that *Paragraph*.

Sect. III.

S. Peter *the Apostle of the Circumcision*; *The agreement betwixt the Apostles.* Peter's *preaching to* Cornelius.

Num. 1. HIs second *exception* is to the position it self of *Peter's* being the *Apostle* of the *Jewes* exclusively to the *Gentiles*, and it is in these words:

2. *His position is as directly against Scripture, as if he had done it on purpose, the Scripture telling us how by a special vision S.* Peter *was commanded to preach to* Cornelius *a Gentile first of all the Apostles, and himself in the Councel of* Jerusalem *protesting the same; and yet this Doctor can teach he was made Apostle to the Jewes, exclusively to the Gentiles, though all story say the contrary.*

3. The position, which is here said to be so *directly against the Scripture*, was to my understanding the expresse *affirmation* of *Scripture* it self, I am sure from thence it was that I learnt it, and I must fail very much in my expectation, if this *Gentleman* himself doe not acknowledge the *testimony* produced, *Gal.* 2. 7. to be sufficient ground to inferre it. There *Peter* is said to be πεπιστευμένο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας, *intrusted with the Gospel of the circumcision*, That the *circumcision* there signifies the *Jews*, and the εὐαγγέλιον, which we render *Gospel*, the *office* of *preaching* or *revealing* the *faith* to them, ἀπόστολὴ

ἀκροβυστίας

περιτομῆς *the Apoſtolacy of the circumciſion*, ver. 8. if it be not of it ſelf plain enough, 'tis made ſo by ver. 9. where it is added that *Peter* &c. were by agreement to go εἰς περιτομὴν *to the circumciſion*, where *circumciſion*, being the object or term of his motion, muſt needs be the *Jewes*, not *circumciſion* it ſelf, and ſo Saint *Chryſoſtome* at large expounds it, ὐ τὸ πρᾶγμα ἀλλὰ τὰς Ἰουδαίους, not to ſignifie the *thing*, *circumciſion*, but the *perſons*, the *Jewes*, in oppoſition to τὰ ἔθνη *the Gentiles*, in the former words, and then *going to* them muſt needs be *preaching* to them, going to them as to a *Province*, the care of which was intruſted to him; and the *right hands of fellowſhip*, the agreement that was made betwixt them, *James* the *Biſhop* of *Jeruſalem*, and *Peter*, and the *beloved diſciple* on one ſide, and *Paul* and *Barnabas* on the other ſide, is ſure the interpretation of the πεπίστευμαι the *being intruſted* or having that, as a *Province*, *committed* to them.

4. And this is the ſpecial importance, ſaith S. *Chryſoſtome*, of the ἀλλὰ τοναντίον, *but contrariwiſe* (the beginning of ver. 7.) as that is oppoſed to the προσανέθεντο their *adding* to him v. 6. *James*, ſaith he, and *Peter* and *John*, were ſo farre from *oppoſing* any thing that he had done, from adviſing any thing more, from telling him any *circumſtance* more than before he knew, that they not onely approved, but *commended* what he had done, and to ſet the things the more unqueſtionably for the *future*, made this *agreement* with him and *Barnabas*, that whenſoever they ſhould come to the ſame *city*, mixt of *Jewes* and *Gentiles*, *Peter* and *John* ſhould betake themſelves to the *Jewiſh*, and *Paul* and *Barnabas* to the *Gentile* part of it. For, as was ſaid, it was not by any *particular aſſignation* of *Chriſt*'s, but by *agreement* among themſelves that this aſſignation of *Provinces* was made.

5. And therefore as in point of *propriety*, when that which is ſuppoſed to lie by *nature* in *common* to all, is, to avoid *contentions* and *confuſions*, and the ſtate of *perpetual hoſtility*, ſo diſtributed by *agreement* among the *fellow-communers*, as that one portion ſhall be aſſigned as the *propriety* and *appartment* of one, the other of another, then and from thenceforth that

which is the *proportion* of one, is ſo his, that it belongs to no other, and again ſo *his*, that he hath no *right* to any other part (which I ſhould expreſſe by ſaying that that *part* is *his excluſively* to any *other* part, for ſure his ſtanding to any ſuch *diviſion* cuts him out, and ſo *excludes* him from any *farther* right) ſo here after this *agreement* between thoſe *Apoſtles* jointly made, concerning the *two parts* of mankinde, *Jewes* and *Gentiles*, to which they were to *preach*, and among whom to *preſide*, the *Jewes* are become S. *Peter's* peculiar, or *portion*, or *Province*, and that ſo *his*, as the *Gentiles* were not *his*, they being left to S. *Paul* (and *Barnabas*) who is both there affirmed to have them *committed* to him, and *Rom.* 11. 13. to be the *Apoſtle* of the *Gentiles*; And that I expreſt by that phraſe, *Peter was the Apoſtle of the Jewes* (ſo it is ſaid of him expreſly *Gal.* 2. 8.) *excluſively to the uncircumciſion*] and truly I knew not (nor yet doe) how to expreſſe it more *ſignificatively*, and more to the rendring of the *full* importance of thoſe plain *texts*, and this *Gentleman* hath not pleaſed to direct me how to doe it better.

6. And having the *Scripture* thus clear and irrefragable for my *poſition*, if now I ſhould not be able to ſalve the *Antinomies*, to anſwer his *objections* from *ſcripture* to it, this were certainly but my *dulneſs* (another that hath a greater ἀξύνετα might be *able* to doe it) and therefore ought not to be any *prejudice* to the *truth* of the *affirmation*. But unleſſe the *difficulties* be greater than as *yet* appear, I ſhall not much doubt of undertaking the *taske*, of reconciling all the ἐναντιοφάνειαι that can be *phanſied*.

7. For what if *Peter* by *ſpecial viſion* was once commanded to *preach* to *Cornelius* a *Gentile*? Sure this is very *competible* with my *poſition*, For not to mention that this is acknowledged to have been a *peculiar commiſſion* by *ſpecial viſion* determined to that *particular* perſon and his *family*, which, till he had this *viſion*, he thought it utterly *unlawfull* to preach to, *Act.* 10. 28. (And it is certain that one *ſpecial* caſe were no *prejudice* to the *general* poſition) and again that *Cornelius* though a *Gentile*, was yet a *Proſelyte* of the *Jews*, ſuch as they called a *Proſelyte* of the *gates*, though not of *juſtice*, a σεβόμενος

φοβ- or *devout* man, though not *circumciſed*; To omit theſe, I ſay, the *anſwer* is obvious, 1. That this *agreement*, of which I ſpeak, was at the time of *Paul*'s going up to *Jeruſalem*, *Act.* 15. i.e. ſome years *after* this of *Peter*'s preaching to *Cornelius*, as may appear *Gal.* 2. 1. which defines it to be about 14 *years* after S. *Paul*'s *converſion*, whereas that of *Peter*'s preaching to *Cornelius*, *Act.* 10. placed in the next *chapter* to that which deſcribed the *converſion* of *Paul*, muſt needs be ſome conſiderable ſpace *before* this time of his going up to the *Councel* at *Jeruſalem*. And ſo that of *Peter*'s preaching to *Cornelius*, and his *proteſting* the ſame in the *Councel* of *Ieruſalem*, hath nothing of *oppoſition* to this *agreement* (made for the *future*, ſure, not for the time *paſt*) what ſhould be done in their *after-preaching*, I ſuppoſe I need adde no more to that which is thus *evident*.

8. *Secondly*, I have already ſufficiently * expreſt, how farre this *agreement* extended, and how farre *excluſive* it was, not that it ſhould be *unlawful* for *Peter* to preach to a *Gentile*, or for *Paul* to preach to a *Iew*, but that when they met in the *ſame city* (as at *Antioch* certainly they did, and at *Rome* alſo I make no *queſtion*) then the one ſhould conſtantly apply himſelf to the *Iewes*, receive *diſciples*, form them into a *Church*, leave them to be governed by a *Biſhop* of *his* aſſignation, and the other ſhould doe in like manner to the *Gentiles*.

* *Tract of Schiſm*, c. 4. §. 7.

9. And that this was ſo in the *conſequents* of the ſtory, is largely ſhewed in that *Tract*. What could have been ſaid more punctually to prevent this *exception* taken from *Peter*'s *preaching* to *Cornelius*, I cannot yet diſcern. I wiſh this *Gentleman* had pleaſed to take notice of it; As it is, I hope he will *now* be more ſure to doe ſo.

c. 4. §. 8. &c.

Sect. IV.

Paul's first preaching to the Iewes in every city. To what the agreement between him and Peter *belonged.*

Num. 1. ANother argument he adds much to the ſame purpoſe, which will make his *third Exception.*

2. *Again, if he were made the Apoſtle of the Iewes, excluſively to the Gentiles, by the ſame reaſon S.* Paul *was made Apoſtle of the Gentiles excluſively to the Iewes, for the words are like; and yet the ſcripture teacheth us that whereever he came, he preached firſt to the Iewes: Is not this to make ſcripture ridiculous?*

3. Here is great *ſeverity* again, a charge of making *ſcripture ridiculous*, But I hope I have been farre from any *guilt* of it. That S. *Paul*, whenſoever he came to a *city*, where the *faith* had not been *preached*, and where there was any *ſynagogue* of the *Iewes*, went into that *ſynagogue* in time of their *publick* aſſembling, I never made any *queſtion*, were this *before*, or were it *after* the *ſtory* of *Act.* 15. when I ſuppoſe this agreement to be made betwixt him and S. *Peter*, &c.

4. Great *reaſon*, and no ſmall *obligation* there was for that; For 1. *Chriſt* had commanded that the *preaching* ſhould *begin at Ieruſalem*, the *Metropolis* of the *Iewes*, and as to the *Iewes firſt* (ὑμῖν πρῶτον) *God had raiſed up his Son Ieſus*, *Act.* 3. 26. ſo the *Goſpel* of the *reſurrection* was to be revealed (Ἰουδαίῳ πρῶτον) *to the Iew firſt*, *Rom.* 1. 16.

5. And although in *Paul's commiſſion* from *Chriſt* it were peculiarly expreſt that he ſhould *preach the Goſpel to the Gentiles*, *Act.* 9. 15. & 22. 21. yet according to this great *fundamental œconomie* he counted it *neceſſary*, *firſt* to make tender of his *ſervice*, and of the glad *tidings* of the *Goſpel*, to the *Iewes*, and ſo he tells them *Act.* 13. 46. *It was neceſſary that the word of God ſhould firſt have been ſpoken to you*, and till the *Iewes* refuſe it and *reject* it, he doth not betake himſelf ſo *peculiarly* to the *Gentiles.*

6. Again, this was in ſome meaſure neceſſary to his *publiſhing* the *Faith*, For that was moſt advantageouſly to be done in the *publick Aſſemblies*, that it might be known to *all* that were

were in the *city*: And the *ſynagogues* of the *Iewes* being ſuch, were in all reaſon by him, that was a *Iew*, to be preferred before the *Idolatrous Temples* of the *heathens*: And according to theſe *obligations*, and inducements, ſo generally he did; But then as this no way *prejudiceth* his title of *Apoſtle* of the *Gentiles*, to which he was at the firſt aſſigned by *Chriſt*, ſo neither is it any way *contrary* to, or unreconcileable with the *agreement* which I ſuppoſe to be made between him and *Peter* and *Iohn*, which concerned onely thoſe *cities* and *regions*, where they *met*, and came to plant *Churches*; There, and there onely it is, that I *affirm* this *diſtribution* of *Provinces* to have been made, and conſequently the *affirmation* is no farther in any *juſtice* to be extended, than thus, that when they ſo *met*, *Paul* betook himſelf to the *Gentile* part, compacted the *Gentile proſelytes* or *believers* into a *Church*, put them into the *hands* of a *Biſhop* of his own *aſſignation*, *Ignatius* at *Antioch*, *Timothy* at *Epheſus*, whereas *Euodius* was in the former, *Biſhop* of the *Iewiſh* part, and in the *latter*, and in all *Aſia*, *Iohn* was the *Apoſtle* of the *circumciſion*, and conſtituted *Biſhops* there. And this I ſuppoſe, without farther inlarging, may ſatisfie the importunity of his *ſecond Argument*.

Sect. V.

Of the Gentiles being S. Paul's *Province peculiarly.*

Num. 1. HIs *fourth exception* is to my *producing* the words of *ſcripture*, *Gal.* 2. 7, 9. to the proof of my *poſition*, Thus,

2. *But he goes on telling us, that the Gentiles excluſively to the circumciſion were the lot of S.* Paul *by S.* Peter's *own confeſſion, his words are, for the uncircumciſion or Gentiles they were not S.* Peter's *Province, but peculiarly S.* Paul's *&c. but look on the place and you ſhall finde no word of excluſion as* [*pecu'iarly*] *is, and whereon lieth the whole queſtion, ſo that the Doctors evidence is his own word againſt the main torrent of ſcripture on the other ſide.*

3. How truly it is ſuggeſted, that the *torrent* of the *ſcripture* is againſt me, hath already been made manifeſt in the fore-

going *sections*, where the *contrary* appearances, by this *Gentleman* produced, as they are farre enough from a *main torrent*, or from the *common* force of such, (or but even of an *ordinary stream*) *carrying* the whole *businesse* before them, so they are severally examined, and allowed, as farre as they have any *force* in them, and found perfectly reconcileable with our pretensions.

4. And so likewise it hath already been cleared in what sense this *Apostle* of the *Gentiles*, so styled by himself, and so, by *agreement* betwixt the *Apostles*, acknowledged by S. *Peter*, was so, *peculiarly* or *exclusively* to the *Iewes*.

5. As for his *argument* drawn onely from hence, that in the *text* to the *Galatians* there is no word of *exclusion*, that sure is of little force; If there were any *agreement*, and *division*, and *several* assignation of *Provinces*, it must follow that what was said to be *one* mans *Province*, is his, so as it is *not* the *others*, and so *peculiarly*, and so as farre as that *agreement* holds, *exclusively* his, As in the *estate* first held in *common*, and then after by *agreement* divided, it hath appeared so evidently, that I need *adde* no more to that matter.

Sect. VI.

Of S. Peter's *withdrawing from the Gentile-communion. Of the Gentile diet. The prudence of S.* Peter's *action.*

Num. 1. HIs *fift Exception* concerns an *incidental* passage about S. *Peter*, and is an *actio injuriarum.*

2. *Again* (saith he) *see how he wrongs S.* Peter *and his Iewish*
Sect. 8, 9. *Proselytes, where he saies he withdrew from all communion with the Gentile Christians. Whereas the text expresseth no more, than that he withdrew from eating with them, that is keeping the Gentile diet.*

3. What *wrong* I have done S. *Peter* and his *Gentile Proselytes*, I am yet to learn, nor am I sure that I know wherein this *Gentleman* placeth the supposed *injury*, But I think it most *probable* to consist in this, that I say he *withdrew from all communion with the Gentile Christians*, whereas he conceives that

that he *withdrew* onely from *keeping the Gentile diet.*

4. But 1. let me demand of this *Gentleman*, what he means by *Gentile diet?* I ſuppoſe uſing thoſe ſorts of *meats*, which were by the *Jewiſh law* forbidden; And if that be acknowledged of S. *Peter*, that he would not thus *eat* with the *Gentiles*, leſt he ſhould ſeem to *offend* againſt the *Jewiſh law*, then by the ſame reaſon he muſt certainly be ſuppoſed to *abſtain* from other *communion* with them, becauſe it was equally againſt the *Iewiſh law*, that a *Iew* ſhould *converſe* with a *Gentile*, as the *woman* of *Samaria* tells *Chriſt*, when he *ſpake* to her, but to *draw* him ſome *water*. *Ioh.*4.9. *How*, ſaid ſhe, *doſt thou being a Iew aſk me to drink* (and it was but *water*, none of the *interdicted Gentile diet*) *being a woman of Samaria?* and either *ſhe* or the *Evangeliſt* renders the *reaſon*, in as *comprehenſive* termes as mine were, ἐ γὰρ συγχρῶνται Ἰουδαῖοι Σαμαρείταις, *for the Iewes have no dealings with the Samaritanes*, and accordingly v. 27. the *diſciples marvelled that he talked with the woman.* And therefore certainly *Peter* did abſtain from all thoſe other waies of *converſe* and *communion* with the *Gentiles*, which the *Iewes* thought as *unlawfull*, as *eating* of the *Gentile diet*, or elſe he failed of the *end* of his action, which is evident what it was, a fear of *ſcandalizing* his countreymen, and from thence a ſhew of *compliance* with them, leſt he ſhould be thought by thoſe that came from *Ieruſalem* to *forſake* the *Iudaical law.*

5. That the very *preaching* to a *Gentile* (which was the *looſeſt* degree of *communion*) was, according to the *Iewiſh principles* as *unlawfull* as *eating* any *unclean meat*, uſing the *Gentile diet*, is plain by *Peter's proviſion*, *Act.* 10.12. where the one is *repreſented* by the other, and had he not received that *viſion*, which made it *lawful* to him to *eat* all *kinde* of *meats*, he acknowledgeth that he durſt not have adventured to *come to one of another nation*, v.28. affirming in as plain words as could be, that it was an *unlawful* thing for a *man that was a Iew to keep company or come to one of another nation*, κολλᾶσθαι ἢ προσέρχεσθαι, which certainly includes *all communion*, and not onely that of the *Genile diet*. Thus unhappy is this *Gentleman* continually in his *objections.*

It

6. It were here obvious, and easie to shew the *opinion* of the *Antients* of the *prudence* and no kinde of *uncharitableness* of S. *Peters* action, which would farther evidence how farre I am from *wronging* S. *Peter* or his *Proselytes*, in affirming what I affirm of them. But the present objection doth not make that necessary, I referre the *Reader* for it to the (Ἑρμηνεία) *interpretation*, or *Comments* of * S. *Chrysostome*, who sets it down exactly † not as a *quarrel*, but as an οἰκονομία, an act of *prudent managery*, a *wise ordering*, designed by him and S. *Paul*, as most likely to reduce the *Iewes* from their *errors*, when he that did thus much to comply with them (not for *fear* of *persecution* from them, but for *fear* of *averting* them from *Christianity*) and was herein *seemingly* opposed by S. *Paul* (the κατεγνωσμένῳ ἦν v. 11. being not to be rendred, *he was to be blamed*, in *Paul*'s opinion, but *he was blamed* by the *Gentile Christians*) made no manner of *reply* in *defense* of that *compliance* with the *Iewes*, and so yeilded that S. *Paul* was in the right, and not the *Iudaizers*. This *interpretation* of *Chrysostome* is followed by the *Greek Commentators*, and taken up by *Ierome*, but disliked by *Augustine* in his *Epistles* to *Ierome*, and therefore I lay not *weight* upon it, nor have my *pretensions* any need of it.

* *Savil: ed:* t. 3. p. 730, 731.

† ὁ μάχης τὰ ῥήματα ἀλλ' οἰκονομίας.

Sect. VII.

The two plantations of Gentile and Iewish Christians at Antioch. Euodius *and* Ignatius. *The differences of the Antients about them reconciled. The two Bishops at* Rome. *Iewes in* England. Simon Zelotes. Gentium Ecclesia *the Church of Iewes as well as Gentiles.*

Num. 1. HAving gained so little by the several steps of his *exceptions*, and the *position* remaining still firm against all, I have lesse reason to suspect what is *built* upon this *foundation* in the insuing *sections*: Yet against them altogether he casts one *stone*, before he will part, in these words,

2. *Upon this wisely laid ground, he would perswade us, followed the division of the Bishopricks both in* Antioch *and* Rome, *but bringing*

bringing not one word of Antiquity proving this to have been the cauſe, yet is he ſo certain of it, that he will finde a colonie of Iewes even in England, *for fear S.* Peter *ſhould have touched a Gentile, and yet he cites S.* Proſper, *that both S.* Peter *and S.* Paul *founded the Church of Gentiles in* Rome.

3. What force there is in any part of this *ſuggeſtion*, I ſhall not here need to ſet down at large. There be *three* branches of it, 1. That I *bring not a word of antiquity* to prove (what I ſay) that this is the *cauſe* of the *diviſions of the Biſhopricks both in* Antioch *and* Rome. 2. That I will *finde a Colonie of Iewes in* England. 3. That I *cite* Proſper, *that both S.* Peter *and S.* Paul *founded the Church of Gentiles in* Rome.

4. For the *firſt*, I deſire the Reader to *review* what is already ſaid in the *Tract* of *Schiſm* c.4. from §.8. to §.20. and I ſhall much wonder if he return of this *Gentleman's* minde, that there is *not one word* there brought out of *Antiquity* to *confirm* what I ſay. The ſhort is, It is there manifeſted from *Antiquity*, that the *Church* of *Antioch* was *founded* by S. *Peter* and S. *Paul*, that there were *two Churches* there, one of *Iewiſh*, the other of *Gentile Chriſtians*, that in thoſe *Churches* at the ſame time ſate *two* diſtinct *Biſhops*, *Euodius* and *Ignatius*; by which means ſome appearing *difficulties* in *antient* writers are explained.

5. To what is there ſaid, I ſhall, inſtead of *repeating*, *adde* thus much more. Of *Euodius*, *Suidas's* words will be eaſily turned to, in Χειροτονεῖ, Ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου βασιλέως Ῥωμαίων, Πέτρῳ τῷ Ἀποστόλῳ χειροτονήσαντι Εὐόδιον ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ &c. *In the reign of Claudius Cæſar, Peter the Apoſtle ordained Euodius Biſhop at Antioch.* Of *Ignatius* the * *Author* of the *Conſtitutions* is expreſſe, Ἰγνάτιος ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου, *Ignatius was ordained Biſhop there by S. Paul.* Now ſeeing in thoſe *Acts* of *Ignatius* which are put together by *Simeon Metaphraſtes*, *Ignatius* is ſaid to *ſucceed Euodius*, as *Euodius ſucceeded Peter* (Πέτρου μὲν † μεγάλου Εὐόδιος διαδέχεται. Εὐόδιον δὲ Ἰγνάτιος) and the *Anonymus antient* writer of the *Acts* of *Ignatius*, which remains *unprinted*, hath the ſame, Εὐόδιον γὰρ Ἰγνάτιος διαδέξατο *Ignatius ſucceeded Euodius*, and ſeeing this *ordination* of *Ignatius* is alſo ſaid by † *Theodoret*, and by * *Felix* III. *Biſhop* of

* l. 7. c. 47.

† in Ἀλεξάνδρῳ

* *Epiſt. ad Zenon.*

of *Rome* to have been done by the *hand* of Saint *Peter*, This seeming difference is removed by * *Ioannes Malela Antiochenus*, who thus sets down the whole matter, ἐν τῷ ἀνιέναι αὐτὸν (Πέτρον) ἐν τῇ Ῥωμῇ, διερχομένῳ αὐτῷ διὰ Ἀντιοχείας τῆς Μεγάλης, σωίξη τελευτήσαι Εὐόδιον τὸν Ἐπίσκοπον, καὶ Παλιαρχεῦσαι Ἀντιοχείας, καὶ ἔλαβε τὸ χρῖσμα τῆς Ἐπισκοπῆς Ἰγνάτιος, τῶν ἁγίων Πέτρου τοῦ Ἀποστόλου χειροτονήσαντος αὐτὸν καὶ ἐνθρονίσαντος, *When Peter went to Rome, passing by Antioch the great, Euodius Bishop and Patriarch of Antioch happened to die, and Ignatius* (who was, as was said, first *constituted* by S. *Paul* over the *Gentiles* there) *received the Bishoprick* (that I suppose must now be, of the *Iewish Province* also, over which *Euodius* had been in his life time) S. *Peter ordaining and enthroning him*, And so that is become most clear which * S. *Chrysostome* said of this *Ignatius*, that αἱ χεῖρες μακαρίων Ἀποστόλων χεῖρες &c. *the hands of the blessed Apostles*, (in the *plural*, first of *Paul*, then of *Peter*) *had been laid on Ignatius*.

* in *Chron:* (MS. *Oxon:*) l. 10.

* *Enom: Ignat:*

6. Sect. 9. The other part which concerned *Rome*, * was so cleared by the words of *Epiphanius*, who saith of *Peter* and *Paul* both, that they were ἐν Ῥώμῃ Ἀπόστολοι καὶ Ἐπίσκοποι, *Apostles and Bishops at Rome*, and so many other evidences produced to the same purpose, from the *inscription* on their *tombs*, by *Gaius* contemporary to *Pope Zephyrinus*, by *Dionysius Bishop* of *Corinth*, by *Prosper*, by the *seals* of the *Popes*, and so again Sect. 12. by the *Ecclesiastick story*, that makes *Clemens S. Peters Deacon* and *successor* in the *Bishoprick*, and *Linus S. Paul's*, that sure there can be no need of farther proofs or *testimonies* from *Antiquity* in this matter.

7. Sect. 14. Whilst in the mean, other *Churches* are * instanced in, particularly the *Churches* of *Asia*, wherein S. *Paul* and S. *Iohn* had all the *command*, and S. *Peter* had nothing to doe, whether in *planting* or *governing* them, which alone is sufficient to carry the whole matter against S. *Peter's universal Pastorship*, and no word is by this *Gentleman* replied to that so considerable a part of my *probation*, Onely instead of it, a farre more compendious way, that of the *scornfull* or *fastidious scoffing* at my *wisely laid ground*, as he pleaseth to call it, and adding that I *bring not one word of Antiquity* &c.

As

8. As to the *ſecond branch* of his *ſuggeſtion*, that I *will finde a colonie of Iewes in England*, that is no where ſaid by me, Onely thus, that upon *ſuppoſition, if the ſaying of Simeon Metaphraſtes* (ſpeaking of S. *Peter's preaching* and *ordaining Biſhops* in *England*, *Neronis* 12) *ſhould be thought to have truth in it*, it muſt be extended no farther than the *Iewes*, which might at that time be *diſperſed* there.

9. Where, as my *concluſion* from that ſuppoſition is founded in the *analogie*, that as, where S. *Paul* and S. *Peter* met in any *plantation*, they divided their *Province* &c. ſo in reaſon it ought to be, where S. *Peter* and *Simon Zelotes*, or *Ioſeph* of *Arimathea* met in like manner, ſo all that of the *Iewes* in *England* I there affirm, is onely this, that it was *poſſible they that were diſperſed in ſo many regions, might be, ſome of them, diſperſed in Britannie*, which how *improbable* ſoever it may appear at that time, is ſure as *probable*, as that S. *Peter preached* and *ordained Biſhops* in *Britannie*, and in *conſequence* to that onely it was, that I made the *ſuppoſition* of the *poſſibility* of it, knowing it the affirmation of our *Antiquaries*, that *Ioſeph* of *Arimathea*, or *Simon Zelotes* ('tis poſſible alſo that *Simeon Metaphraſtes* might miſtake *Simon Peter* for him and then that matter is at an *end*) planted the *faith* in this *Iſland*.

10. As for his laſt *ſuggeſtion*, that I *cite Saint* Proſper, *that both S* Peter *and S.* Paul *founded the Church of Gentiles in* Rome, I deſire the truth of it may be conſidered by the words which I cite from him, *In ipſa Hieruſalem Iacobus & Ioannes apud Epheſum, Andreas & cæteri per totam Aſiam, Petrus & Paulus Apoſtoli in urbe Roma Gentium Eccleſiam pacatam unamque poſteris tradentes ex dominicâ pactione ſacrârunt*, James *at* Jeruſalem, John *at* Epheſus, Andrew *and the reſt through all* Aſia, Peter *and* Paul *at* Rome, *conſecrated the Church of the Nations*. What *Nations* were theſe, ſure of *Iewes*, as well as *Gentiles*, elſe *Jeruſalem* could not be any *part* of them, no nor *John's* converts at *Epheſus*, for they were *Iewes*, and therefore this *Gentleman* did not doe well to ſubſtitute the word *Gentiles* for *Nations*, and yet could not, without doing ſo, have made this *exception* to my words.

11. And so much for *exceptions* to my *first evidence* against the *Universal Pastorship* of Saint *Peter*.

Sect. VIII.

*No promise of Keyes to S.*Peter, *which was not made and performed to all the Apostles*, Joh.20.21. *the completion of the promise*, Mat.16.19. Pasce oves. Joh. 21. *an exhortation, not commission.*

Num. 1. THe *second sort* of *Exceptions* follows, those against my *evidence* drawn from the *power* of the *Keyes*, which I say, and prove both from *Scripture*, and expresse *testimonies* of the *Fathers*, that it was given *equally* to *all* the *Apostles*; And his *exceptions* begin thus:

2. *A second evidence he bringeth from the donation of the Keyes, which he saith were given equally to the Apostles*, Mat.28. *yet confesseth the Keyes were especially promised to S.*Peter, Mat.16. *but performed onely in common*, Mat.28. *which though they may be both true, yet is absurdly said, for who acknowledgeth a special promise, should have found out a special performance, which is done*, Joh. 21.

3. This *exception* being not to the *matter* of what I say, but to the *absurdnesse* of the *expression* (to which *censure* I must suppose every thing liable, which is *contrary* to his *pretensions*, and yet proved so *manifestly* that it cannot be *denied* by him) I shall briefly *evidence* how *commodious*, and *proper* the *expression* was.

4. And 1. whereas he sets it down as my *confession*, that the *Keyes* were *especially promised to S.Peter*, this is not with *truth* Sect.10. suggested; My words are, *This power Mat.16.19. is promised to S.Peter.*] But the [*especially*] is an *interpolation* of this *Gentleman's*, to prepare my words for his *exceptions*, for which otherwise they were no way *qualified*.

5. All that can be fetcht from any words of mine toward this *sense*, is, that in the *next Section*, I *foresaw*, and so mentioned an *objection* from *Christ's* making this *promise* to him *peculiarly* (and yet even that is not, to him *especially*, but to him *particularly*,

cularly, or *singly*, *I will give unto thee* &c.) To this, as to an *objection*, I presently made *reply*, that the *repetition* of that *promise* *Mat.* 18. 18. to *all* the *Apostles indefinitely*, and without any *peculiarity* of *restriction* (*I say to you*, in the *plural*, and, *Whatsoever ye shall binde* &c.) will take away all *appearance* from this *objection*.

6. And so it will from this *Gentleman's exception* also, For if what was at one time *promised* to S. *Peter* singly, was so soon after promised to all the *Apostles indefinitely*, what *absurdity* is there in *seeking* no other *performance* of this *promise*, than that which was at once afforded to *all* the *Apostles* together, in the *descent* of the *Holy Ghost*, when the *fire*, that represented that *Spirit*, divided and *sat upon every one* of them, and they were *all filled with the holy Ghost*, and no shew of *peculiarity*, or mark of *especiall* eminence to S *Peter* in all this.

7. As suppose a *Generall* should *promise* a *Commission* this day to *one*, and to morrow should make the like promise to *eleven* more, that one being in their *company*, and then, upon a set day, some *weeks* after, should send 12 *Commissions* sealed to those 12, one for *each* of them, I wonder who would doubt of the *exact* performance of this *promise* to that *first*, or *seek* for any more *special performance* of it.

8. But this *Gentleman* having phansied a *special promise* (as that is with him somewhat more than a *particular promise*, for otherwise a *common performance* might have served the *turn*, it being certain that an *Universal* contains every *particular* under it) must needs have a *special performance*, and that *Ioh.* 21. I suppose in those words of *Christ* to S. *Peter*, *Feed my sheep*, and, *Feed my lambs*, thrice repeated.

9. But for this, 1. I cannot acknowledge that it hath any *particular* reference to the words of the *promise*, *Mat.* 16. 19. The *promise* was, *I will give thee the Keyes*— and, *Whatsoever thou shalt binde*— And sure the direct completion of this, as farre as could be expected from *Christ* personally, whilst he was here on *earth*, is that of *Ioh.* 20. 21. where, as the *sending* or *commissionating* is answerable to *giving* the *Keyes*, the insigne of the *O Economus*, so *remitting* and *retaining* of *sins* is all one with the *binding* and *loosing*.

10. As for that which is after this *Chap.* 21. It is 1. by that very *position* of it; but 2. more by the *occasion*; and yet more 3. by the *matter* of the words, *prejudged* from being any more than an *exhortation* to *discharge* that *duty*, for which in the former *Chap*: he, with the rest of the *twelve*, had received his *commission*, and so is still as farre from being a *speciall performance*, as that of *Matth.* 16. had been from a *special promise*.

11. The *Pasce oves*, *Feed my sheep* and *lambs*, thrice repeated, was certainly a *direction* to him how he might approve his *love* to that *Master* and *Saviour*, whom he had *thrice renounced*, *testifie* it now to be a *sincere constant love* (such as would *cast out* all *fear* of danger, through which formerly he had *fallen*) by an *eminent* diligence in discharge of that *Pastoral office*, which was intrusted to him, but 'twas not so much as an *intimation*, that his *diligence* would be actually *greater* than all others (for sure S. *Paul* said truth, that he *laboured more abundantly than they all*, of whom S. *Peter* was one) but rather that he, that after such *professions* had *fallen* so *foully*, had the more *need* now of having this proof of his *love* inculcated and prest, lest he should *fail* again (much lesse is it a *sealing* any power or *authority* to him, *above* that which before had been conferred on him, and with him on those others also.

12. And nothing being here offered to prove that there was any more of *energie*, or special *commission* in these words, but onely the thing *crudely* affirmed, by naming *Joh.* 21. there is no need of making any farther *answer*, a bare *deniall* is a proportionable return to an unproved *affirmation*.

13. Onely this I shall adde, that 'tis certain that S. *Peter* thus understood the *reiteration* of *Christ's* question, as a *reproach* of his three *denialls*; The *Text* saith, *Peter was grieved, because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me?* Which sure he would not have been, if he had looked on it, as an *introduction* to so great a preferment, as it must be, if the *supremacy* and *Universal Pastorship* of the *Church* were by those words conferred on him.

Sect.

Sect. IX.

Of the peculiarity of the power given to S. Peter.

Num. 1. TO this head of diſcourſe about the *power* of the *Keyes* follows a *ſecond Exception* in theſe words,

2. *Again he would perſwade the world that the Catholick Church holdeth, none had the Keyes but S.* Peter, *calling it a peculiarity and incloſure of S.* Peter, *as if the other Apoſtles had them not, which is a calumnie.* Sect. 2.

3. How far I have been in this matter from *calumniating* the whole *Catholick Church*, or any one member of it, will appear by this brief *review* of what is there ſaid, It is this, The *power* of the *Keyes* is promiſed S. *Peter*, *Mat.*16. but to him that from hence, *i.e.* from the *promiſing* it to him *ſingly* in that place, pretends this *donative* and conſequent *power* as a *peculiarity* and *incloſure* of *Peter's*, two conſiderations are there offered, and thought ſufficient to ſuperſede any ſuch concluſion.

4. Here certainly a bare *ſuppoſition* will not be the *accuſing* or conſequently *accuſing falſly*, i. e. *calumniating* of any. If no man ſay this, beſides my loſing my pains in *ſuperſeding* ſuch a (but *poſſible*) concluſion, there is no other *harm* done. Onely I ſhall demand, Is that *promiſe* of the *Keyes* to Saint *Peter*, *Mat.*16. made uſe of by a *Romaniſt* to prove *Chriſt's promiſe* of ſome *ſpecial* power to S. *Peter*, which was not *promiſed* to the *other Apoſtles?* If this *Gentleman* anſwer, No; then 1. I muſt inferre, that this *Gentleman* is no *Romaniſt*, becauſe in this very *page* he mentions the firſt words of this *text*, *Tu es Petrus*, as one of the two moſt *conſiderable* texts of *Scripture*, fit to be alledged for S. *Peter's ſupremacy*. 2. I ſhall conclude from this his preſent ſuppoſed *negation*, together with his own words in the laſt *Paragraph*, that the words of *Chriſt*, *Ioh.*21. *Feed my ſheep* &c.] were not the *inſtating* of any *power* on S. *Peter*, which was not *common* alſo to the reſt of the *Apoſtles*, for thoſe words *Ioh.*21. were, ſaith he, a *ſpecial performance*, anſwerable to that *promiſe* of the *Keyes* to *Peter*, *Mat.*16. as a *ſpecial promiſe*, and conſequently if there were nothing

nothing in that *promise* peculiar to S. *Peter*, there was nothing in that *performance* peculiar to him. And so neither he nor any *Romanist* must henceforth *conclude* any thing for S. *Peter* from either of those particular *addresses* of *Christ* to him, *Mat.* 16. or *Ioh.* 21. which they will not equally yeild from thence to all the other *Apostles*; And then that will more *compendiously* perform what I by a greater *circuit* of considerations indevoured to doe, i.e. *supersede* all the *Romanists conclusions* from *one* or *both* these places; for certainly if they pretend not to *inferre* somewhat for S. *Peter*, which is not by them *equally* granted to *all* the *rest* of the *Apostles*, all that those *texts* will be able to doe, is to confute the *Presbyterie*, not to establish the *Papacie*, no more being from hence deducible for the *Bishop* of *Rome* the *successor* of one *Apostle*, than for the severall other *Bishops*, *successours* of the other *Apostles*.

5. But if upon the sight of these *consequences*, he shall now say, that in this of *Mat.*16.19. there is any thing, be it never so little (so as to be capable of the *phrase* a *special promise*) ensured upon S. *Peter*, which was not elsewhere promised also to the other *Apostles*, I shall then conclude, that it seems I have not *calumniated* him, or the *Church* which he *defends*, in saying that they make this *power* a *peculiarity* and *inclosure* of Saint *Peter*, for so it must be, if it belong to him and not to others.

6. And 'tis not sufficient to say that the *power* of the *Keyes* was *common* to him with the other *Apostles*, but yet some other *special power* was there reserved to S. *Peter*, For of that *specialty*, whatsoever it is, my present *Dilemma* proceeds, and desires to be informed, whether any *Romanist* conclude it from that *text* of *Mat.*16. and if he doe not, then the *inconveniences* will presse him, which I have here mentioned. If he doe then I shall now conclude anew (not that the *Catholick Church*, but) that this *Catholick Gentleman* holds that which he will not be able to prove, because there is not the least *minute* portion of *power promised* to him in that 16 *Chap:* which is not elsewhere *promised* to all the *Apostles*; *Peter* is called a *stone*, on which the *Church* shall be *built*, and to

Peter

Peter the *Keyes* are *promiſed*; and the *twelve Apoſtles* are in like manner, and all equally *twelve foundation-ſtones* of the ſame *building*, and the *Keyes* are *equally* promiſed to all them. And this being there proved at large §.21. and the *probations* extended, not onely to the *power* of the *Keyes*, but (after) to the *compellation* of *Tu es Petrus* (and they will be *extenſible* to all the moſt *diminutive* imaginary *fractions* of either of thoſe *powers*) I ſhall farther conclude, that whatſoever he ſhall now return to this *Dilemma*, will equally ſecure me from having *calumniated* either him, or the *Church* maintained by him.

Sect. X.

Sitting on twelve Thrones, Mat. 19.

Num. 1. HIs *third Exception* to this *Chap:* is to another *interpretation* of mine, which it ſeems hath not the luck to *approve* it ſelf to him, Thus,

2. *I cannot paſſe without noting another odde interpretation of Scripture, in his* 20 Sect. *out of* Mat. 19. *ſpeaking of the twelve Thrones at the day of Judgment, he explicates, to rule or preſide in the Church.*

3. I doe acknowledge to underſtand the *twelve Thrones*, *Mat.* 19. of the *Apoſtles ruling* and *preſiding* in the *Church*, and S. *Auguſtine* long before ſo underſtood it, and if *Chriſt*'s ſitting on the *throne* of his *glory* may be the *interpretation* of ἐν παλιγγενεσίᾳ, whether it be rendred *in the regeneration*, or *in the reſurrection*, meaning thereby *Chriſt*'s *reſurrection* and *aſcenſion* to the *throne* of his *glory*, there will then be no *difficulty* ſo to underſtand it, that when *Chriſt* was gone to *heaven*, theſe ſhould *ſucceed* him in the *government* of his *Church* on *earth*, and ſo (as the *Phylarchæ ruled* and *judged* the ſeverall *tribes* of *Iſrael*) exerciſe *judicature*, *binde* and *looſe*, *excommunicate* and *abſolve* in the *Church*, no one having the πρωτεία, any more than of *order*, among them.

4. But this *Gentleman* gives no reaſon for *preferring* any other *interpretation*, onely calls mine an *odde* one, And when I

have replied *first*, that this place comes in *ex abundanti*, onely as it is (being thus interpreted) in *concord* with that other of *Mat.* 16. & 18. and therefore *secondly*, it is not an *odde* one, and *thirdly*, the cause in hand will stand as *firm*, though this *interpretation* should be found to have no *truth* in it: *fourthly*, that my *interpretation* is reconcileable with his, and therefore his, if granted, will not be *exclusive* of mine, they that shall *judge* the *world* hereafter may for *some time* have *presided* in the *Church*, and so also *judged here*; *fifthly*, that this * *Annot: on place*, and the *grounds* of this *interpretation* are * elsewhere *Mat.* 19. d. insisted on at large, I shall need adde no more to this *single and Power of Keyes*, c. 5. §. 13. *of* dislike of his, in this place.

Sect. XI.

The equivalence of Πέτρος *and* Πέτρος. *Twelve foundation-stones.*

Num. 1. HE concludes with some shew of dislike of what I had said to the vulgar place of *Tues Petrus*, Thus,

2. *His quibling about the word is so light a thing, as it is not worth consideration, the sense being plain, that upon* Peter *the Church was built specially, though not with exclusion of others.*

3. What I said of the *equivalence* and perfect *identity* of the words, Πέτρος and Πέτρα for a *stone*, seemed to me particularly usefull to the understanding of the meaning of *Christ*'s speech, when he said, he would *build* his *Church* on this πέτρα or πέτρος, i. e. this *stone*. For not to mention what hath by divers of the *Antients* been said of that *text*, applying it not to the *person* of S. *Peter*, but to the *faith*, whereof he then had newly made *confession*, I was here willing to grant the *Romanist* the utmost that he could pretend to, *viz:* that the *person* of *Peter* was that *Petra* or *stone*, on which *Christ* promised to *build* his *Church*: And why this *Gentleman* should be so unwilling to be *gratified*, or why the setting down the bare *notation* of the *Greek* word, should deserve his *reproach*, and be called *quibling* or *levity*, I professe I can render no reason but

but his *haſte*, which permitted him not to conſider either the *undeniable* truth, or his own *advantages* from what was ſaid.

4. The force of my anſwer lay in *another* branch of that *fourth Section*, viz: that this *ſtone*, from whence *Peter* had his name, peculiarly relating to a *building*, and ſo being to be conſidered as a *foundation ſtone*, not onely he, but *all* the reſt of the *Apoſtles* were herein made *equall* with *Peter*, being all partakers of this *common* appellation, δεκὰλιθοι δώδεκα *twelve foundations*, *Apoc.* 21.14. and thoſe by circumſtances in that *text* manifeſted to have an *equal* proportion of *power* and *Province* aſſigned to *each* of them. And to this there is nothing here anſwered by this *Gentleman*, and his unprovoked quarrel at that, which was ſaid concerning the *nature* of the word, is an *indication* that he had nothing more to *object* to it.

5. When therefore he ſaith, that *on* Peter *the Church was built eſpecially*, I demand what he means by *ſpecially?* If no more than that he was one *ſpecial* perſon, on whom the *Church* was *built*, then I grant it, and reply, that ſo was *John*, and ſo was *Andrew*, and ſo was every other of the *twelve*, a *ſpecial foundation-ſtone* of the *Church*. But if by [*ſpecially*] he mean in an *extraordinary*, or more *eminent* manner, than any of the other *Apoſtles*, Then I anſwer, 1. that *Chriſt*'s telling him he was a *ſtone*, on which he would *build* his *Church*, implies no ſuch matter, the other *Apoſtles* each of them are by *Chriſt*, in *viſion* to S. *John*, affirmed to be *foundations* of this *building*, as well as he; 2. That among *foundation-ſtones* there is but one, that hath any *eminence* above others, and that is the ἀκρογωνιαῖος, the *chief* or *head-corner-ſtone*, and that title belongs not to S. *Peter* (as neither to any other *Apoſtle*) but onely to *Chriſt* himſelf, *Epheſ.* 2. 20. And ſo ſtill nothing belongs to *Peter* in this matter of being a *ſtone* or *foundation*, which doth not *equally* appear to belong to thoſe *others*, as well as him. And ſo much for the *vindicating* of the *Evidences* ſet down in the *fourth Chapter*.

Chap. V.

An Anſwer to the Exceptions made to the fift Chapter.

Sect. I.

Of ſlight paſſing over Paſce oves, *and* Tu es Petrus.

Num. 1. THe firſt thing he here *excepts* againſt, is my *too ſlight paſſing over two*, which he thinks the moſt *conſiderable texts*, to ſupport the *ſupremacie* of S. *Peter*, In theſe words,

2. *In the fift Chapter he lightly paſſeth over the two moſt conſiderable Texts of Scripture fit to be alledged for* S. Peter's *ſupremacie, viz:* Feed my ſheep, *and*, Thou art Peter: *becauſe they have no appearance, and have been often anſwered: Why no appearance? becauſe he and his fellows ſay ſo, and as if being ſo often repeated was not as likely to ſhew the anſwer was naught, as the anſwering to impeach the ob ecter: but who underſtands the principles of Catholick Faith, knows, that as well for other points of our Faith, as for this of* S. Peter's *ſupremacy we relie not onely upon ſuch places of Scripture.*

3. For this of the *light paſſing over* thoſe *two places* of *Scripture*, I think I can give a very reaſonable account, 1. From his own words p. 10. where he tells me that I am *miſtaken in thinking that the Catholick ought to prove that the Pope hath an univerſal Primacy*, For if he be not obliged to *prove* it, if the right pretended depend wholly upon *poſſeſſion*, why ſhould not I make haſte, through thoſe *proofs*, which ſome have *ex abundanti* (as to him it ſeems) made uſe of.

4. *Secondly*, I did in the *ſimplicity* of my heart verily believe (what here is recited from me) that thoſe *two texts* had ſo very little *appearance* of *ſtrength* in them, and this ſo often manifeſted by the *variety* of *anſwers* made to them by our *writers*, that no *Romaniſt* would in earneſt have laid ſuch

weight

weight on them, as to require of me a more *punctual anſwer* to them, than I had before given in the former *Chapter*. There I had evidenced that the whole world was not S. *Peter's province*, but onely one *portion* of *one* part of the *world*, the *Jewiſh believers* in *Antioch* and *Rome* &c. the *Gentile Chriſtians* in thoſe very *cities* being under S. *Paul*, and the *Jewiſh* of other *countreys* under other *Apoſtles*, thoſe of *Aſia* under *John* &c.

5. This to my underſtanding made it evident, that in caſe *Chriſt's* Paſce oves &c. *Feed my ſheep* and *my lambs*, were granted to be a form of *commiſſion*, inſtating of *power* on him, it muſt yet be reſtrained to his *particular Province*, ſo as to leave other his *fellow Apoſtles* their *Provinces* alſo, and not extended to an *Univerſal Paſtorſhip*.

6. But then when this *farther* conſideration was behinde, that indeed this of *Paſce oves*] was not the form of *commiſſion* to S. *Peter*, but that in the former *Chapter*, *Joh.*20.21. *as my Father ſent me, ſo ſend I you* &c. and that to S. *Peter* in *common* with the reſt of the *Apoſtles*, and not the leaſt indication of any branch of *power appropriated* to him (on which I have already inſiſted in this *Reply*, though in that *Tract* of *Schiſme* I did not think it neceſſary) I hope I may have pardon for not returning to a *ſtrict* ſurvey of it in that *fift Chapter*.

7. As for that of *Tu es Petrus*, that was the very *text* wherein the *donation* of the *Keyes* was promiſed to S. *Peter*, *Mat.* 16.18. and that had particularly been examined in both parts of it, both as to the *Keyes*, and the *compellation*, in the *fourth Chap:* and the *Keyes promiſed* him, manifeſted by other *texts* to belong *equally* to *all* the other *Apoſtles*, and ſo the compellation of *ſtone*, or (which is all one, as was there ſhewed) *foundation*, or *foundation-ſtone* in the *building* of the *Church*, beſtowed equally upon the reſt of the *twelve Apoſtles* alſo. And ſo conſidering what I had already done my ſelf, and what *others* had done much more largely, there remained little appearance of force in thoſe *texts*, which might ſuggeſt to me a more diligent ſurvey of them. And all theſe together, if not *two* of them alone, were a competent reaſon of *paſſing lightly* over them in that *fift Chapter*, where I was ingaged in a new *ſtage*, i. e. of not returning *afreſh*, and

loco non suo, to a yet *larger* consideration of them.

8. I should now from this *notice* of his *displeasure* indevour to *pacifie* him by reforming my former *omission*, and enter upon a yet more *solemn* survey of these *two texts*, but that I see him already resolved not to trust his cause to the *support* which those *texts* can afford him, telling me in the close, that he *relies not onely on such places of Scripture*, and if I should dwell longer upon them, I should be thought *impertinent*, and again reprehended, as *forgetting what matter I handle*, And therefore till he please to tell me *how farre* he *relies* on them, and shew me that I have not yet removed them from being a *foundation so farre* to be *relied* on, I shall spare mine own and the *Readers* pains, and flatter my self, that I have said much more to *invalidate* any conclusion, which he shall inferre to his *advantage* from these two places, than he hath yet said in my *hearing*, to *confirm* his *pretensions* from both or either of them.

Sect. II.

The Bishop of Antioch's *title from succession to S.* Peter *equal to the Bishops of* Rome. Peter *formed a Church there. His dying at* Rome *no argument.*

Num. 1. AFter his *velitation* he now proceeds to the *weightier impression*, excepting first to an *argument* taken from the *Primogeniture* of *Antioch*, Thus,

2. *Next he urgeth that if the succession to S.* Peter *were the base*
Sect. 3. *of the Popes supremacy*, Antioch *should be the chief See, because S.* Peter *sat there, wherein to omit his first and second question, whereof the first is untrue, I answer to the third negatively, that the constituting a Church and Bishop at* Antioch, *before at* Rome, *did conferre no privilege extraordinary on that Church, and the reason is clearly deduced out of his second Quare, because it was before* Rome, *for he could not give any such authority, but by divesting himself, since there cannot be two heads to one body, and therefore this authority and privilege of S.* Peter *can rest and be no where but where he died.*

In

3. In this matter I must first premise what I had warned the Reader of in that 5 *Chap.* §. 2. that what I there produced against the *power* of the *Bishop* of *Rome*, under the notion of *successour* to S. *Peter*, was perfectly *ex abundanti*, more than *needed*, the whole matter being sufficiently concluded in the former *Chapter*, which concerned S. *Peter's person*, and had shewed that S. *Peter* himself had no *Universal Pastorship* belonging to him, or *supremacy* over any other *Apostle*, from whence it was evidently consequent, that to his *successour*, as such, no such power pertained.

4. This being premised, I did not pretend, that what should then follow, should *proceed* with that *evidence* as to *demonstrate* again what was so sufficiently cleared already, Onely to those, whose *curiosity* was not satisfied, when their *reason* was, I proposed some *considerations*, which pretended to no more than this, that beside that *Peter* had no *supremacy*, there were also other defects in the *Bishop* of *Rome's tenure*, particularly this, that he did no more succeed S. *Peter*, than the *Bishop* of *Antioch* did, nay, that S. *Peter* having left a *successour Bishop* at *Antioch*, before he did at *Rome*, the *Bishop* of *Antioch* had in a manner the *Primogeniture*, and by that, as good (if not a better) title to *praeminence*, as any the *Bishop* of *Rome* had, upon that *tenure* of *succession* from S. *Peter*.

5. Now to this part of discourse which pretended but to *probability*, there can lie no *exception*, unlesse it *appear* either to be *untrue* in any part, or in the whole lesse *probable* than what is offered by the *Romanist* for the other side; And this is now to be examined.

6. And 1. saith he, the *first question* is *untrue*; But he is so reserved as not to expresse his *reason* for so saying. I shall therefore give my *reasons* to the *contrary*. 1. because a *question* cannot be *untrue*, all truth and falshood being in *affirmations* and *negations* (and asking a *question*, or *proposing* a thing to *consideration* whether it be so or no, is neither of those) in *answering*, not in *asking* of *questions*.

7. *Secondly*, Because this *question* being resolved into an *affirmation*, viz: that *Peter* as truely planted a *Church* at *Antioch*, and left a *successour Bishop* there, as he is or can be supposed

to

to have done at *Rome*, it relies on the *uncontradicted Testification* of *antient* writers.

8. By *planting* a *Church* I mean not that he was the *first* that *preacht* the *Gospel* at *Antioch* (though *Leo* the *Great* seems to affirm it, *(in Antiochenâ Ecclesiâ primùm prædicante beato Apostolo Petro, Christianum nomen exortum est, Ep:53.)* and from thence pleads the *right* of *precedence* to belong to that *Church*, *(in paternæ constitutionis ordine perseveret)* against *Anatholius Bishop* of *Constantinople)* for that seems *by* S. *Luke* to be attributed to those that were *scattered abroad* upon the *persecution that rose about S. Stephen*, *Act.* 11. 19. but his *forming* them into a *Church* or *regular assembly*. And that so he did, and left *Euodius Bishop* there, and after his death *Ignatius* the *Martyr*, is elsewhere *manifested* at large, and I shall not *repeat* it, but onely adde one *Testimony* (which I suppose will be *authentick* with him) of *Leo* the *Great*, *Bishop* of *Rome*, *Ep:62.* to *Maximus Bishop* of *Antioch*, bidding him be mindfull of that *doctrine*, *quam præcipuus Apostolorum omnium, beatissimus Petrus per totum mundum quidem uniformi prædicatione, sed speciali Magisterio in Antiochenâ & Romanâ urbe fundavit.* Where it is the clear affirmation of that *Pope*, that S. *Peter* founded the *doctrine* of *Christ* first in *Antioch*, then in *Rome* by a special *authority*, or *power*, or *magisterie*, which he had in those two *cities*, more than in the rest of the world. And so I cannot guesse what untruth there could be in that *affirmation*, if it had been such, which was but a *consideration*, or *question*, as he calls it.

9. Next, he saith, that S. *Peter's constituting* a *Church* and *Bishop* at *Antioch*, before he did the like at *Rome*, is a proof that he conferred no *extraordinary privilege* on *Antioch*, and renders the *reason* for it, because he could not doe it without *divesting himself*, and consequently this *privilege* must rest *no where but where he died*, and consequently at *Rome* onely, because he died there.

10. That he left any *extraordinary privilege* at *Antioch* I doe not believe, any more than he did so at *Rome*, and therefore I cannot be required to *prove* any more than this, that it is as *reasonable* for me to affirm it of *Antioch* upon the title

of

of *ſucceſſion*, as for him to aſſume it of *Rome*, upon the *ſame* title.

11. From *Chriſt* there is nothing that will fix it at *Rome*, rather than at *Antioch*, and in the *Law* of *Nations* concerning *inheritances*, nothing is or can be applied to this purpoſe. It muſt needs be then from the free *act* of S. *Peter*'s will, whatſoever is pretended to. And in reſpect of that 'tis ſure as *reaſonable* to believe, that he which planted a *Church*, and placed a *Biſhop* firſt in one, after in *another* city, ſhould delegate the διπλὴ τιμὴ *double portion*, the greater *dignity* and *privileges* to the *former* as to the *latter*. If the right of *Primogeniture* be no *right* in this matter, yet ſure the *younger ſiſter* hath neither *law*, nor *cuſtome*, that the *inheritance* ſhould belong to *her*.

12. And for his *own reaſon* here offered, that it cannot belong to the *Elder*, that is no *reaſon*; For S. *Peter* might doe, as *Chriſt* did, make an aſſignation of *power* in his life time, fix it by *promiſe*, yet not deveſt himſelf of it till his *death*. And if S. *Peter* had done ſo, if at his planting a *Biſhop* at *Antioch*, on conſideration that in that *city* they were *firſt called Chriſtians*, he had decreed that after his own *death* that *Biſhop* ſhould *ſucceed* to *all* that *authority*, which he had received from *Chriſt*, with *power* to communicate it to any, I ſhall ask this *Gentleman* whether he might not have done it without either *deveſting* himſelf whilſt he *lived*, or making *two* heads to *one* body, or whether his bare dying at *Rome*, would have invalidated any ſuch former act of his, in caſe he had done ſo. If it would, there muſt then be more owing to his *death* than to his *life*, to his *martyrdome* than to his *preaching* or *ordaining* of *Biſhops*, that this *privilege* belongs to *Rome*. And then again *Jeruſalem*, where *Chriſt* himſelf *died*, will by that *title* of his *blood* ſhed *there*, have a more unqueſtionable *right*, than that *city* where *Peter* did but faintly *tranſcribe* that copie, which had in a more eminent manner been ſet him by *Chriſt*.

13. *Laſtly*, If by this *argument* of *Rome*'s being the place where *Peter died*, the *ſupremacy* had belonged to that *See*, *preciſely* or *peculiarly*, how could it be transferred to *Avenion*, as we know it was, and there continued for ſome time? But I ſhall no longer inſiſt on ſuch *fiction* of *caſe*, as this, *if* that had been

which *never Was*, what then would certainly have *followed*, whether if S. *Peter* had been *Universal Pastor*, it must *eo ipso* be concluded that his *successour* of *Rome*, and not at *Antioch* was such after him, when it hath been rendred evident in the former *Chapter*, that S. *Peter* had no such *supremacy*.

Sect. III.

The Act of the Councell of Chalcedon ; *of the ground of* Rome's *precedence. The safety of the Church reconcileable with removing the chief See. Of the Bishop of* Constantinople *being ashamed of that act. No tumult in the Councell. The story of it.*

Num. 1. THe next dislike is to my deriving the *original* of that *precedence* which belongs to *Rome*, as the *Councel* of *Chalcedon* had derived it, Thus,

2. *Then he tells you that the dignity or precedence of the Bishop of* Rome *is surely much more fitly deduced by the Councel of* Chalcedon *from this, that* Rome *was then the Imperial city, or ordinary residence of the Emperour: a very wise judgment, that the quality upon which the unity, that is the safety of the Church Universal relies, should be planted upon a bottome fallible and subject to fail, but the resolution was so shamefull, that the very Patriarch was ashamed, and imputed it to his ambitious clergie, who how tumultuary and unruly they were, is to be seen in the Acts of the Councel.*

3. Here two *objections* are made to the *wisdome* of that *Act* Sect. 5. or *judgment* of that *Councel*, and I that foresaw it would be thus *rejected* by him, and from thence observed how little *Councels* are considered by them, when they *define* not as they would have them, and therefore laid no more weight on that *Canon*, than the *Romanists* very *rejecting* it allowed me, might now spare the pains of *defending* the *judgment* of that *Councel*. Yet it is so easie to return answer in few words to his two *objections*, that I shall not decline doing it.

4. To the first, that the *precedence* of *Rome*, which there I speak of, being a *Primacy* onely of *dignity* and *order*, and not

of

of *Power*, is no ſuch *quality*, on which the *unity* and *ſafety* of the *Church relies*. For how can that be concerned what *Biſhop* ſits *uppermoſt*, gives the *firſt* or *laſt ſuffrage* in a *Councel*? This *Gentleman* thinks of a *ſupremacy* of *power*, when he thus ſpeaks, but that he cannot but know is denied by us to be placed in any one *Biſhop*, and therefore muſt not imagine me to aſſigne the *original* of that, to which I deny a *being*. And it matters not though he ſay I am *injurious* in denying it, for beſides that that is *petitio principii* on his ſide, to ſay ſo, 'tis alſo certain that the *queſtion* now betwixt us in this *Paragraph*, is not whether I am *juſt* in denying that *ſupremacy*, but whether it be more than a *Primacy* of *order*, which I divolve to this *original*.

5. Nay if I had ſpoken of the *ſupremacy* it ſelf, and fixed it on a *bottome* ſo farre *fallible*, as that it might be *removed* by the change of *Empires* from one *city* to another, if it were but reſolved that the *ſupreme Eccleſiaſtical power*, and ſo the *fountain* of *unity* ſhould follow the *Imperial ſeat*, I ſee not why the *ſafety* of the *Church* might not by this means be *provided* for.

6. Let it but be judged of in *little* firſt, as it is eaſily ſuppoſeable. Suppoſe the *Church* of *England* αὐτοκέφαλος, nay for argument's ſake, ſuppoſe there were no other *Church* but that of *England*, and ſuppoſe there were a *ſupremacy* in one *Biſhop*, in him, whoſoever were the *Biſhop* of that *city*, where the *royal throne* were placed, and ſuppoſe that that were for the *preſent* removed to *Yorke*, and ſo that the *Biſhop* of *Yorke* were the *ſupreme Biſhop*, and by that means the *unity* and *ſafety* of the *Church* competently *provided* for, I ſhall then demand, in caſe the *royall ſeat* ſhould be removed to *Wincheſter*, could there be any *queſtion*, but the *ſupreme Epiſcopal See* would be *removed* ſo too? and might not all *appeals* be made from thenceforth to *Wincheſter*, and the ſafety of the *Church* be as well provided for by this way, as by it's being fixt *unmoveably* at *Yorke*?

7. The *Primacy* we know hath oft thus been *removed*, and never more *inconvenience* come of it, than by S. *Peter's See* being removed to *Avenion*. And if any *ſupremacy* belonged

to any *succession* of *Bishops* over the whole *world*, and that were never mutable, but by the *removal* of the *Emperial seat*, a certain, illustriously *visible* thing, it is not easily *discernible*, how this should more *prejudice* the *safety* of the *Church*, than the *change* of that *power* from one *Bishop* that dies, to his *successour* in the same *See*. But this is still much more than needed to have been said.

8. As for the *Patriarch*'s (I suppose he must mean of *Constantinople*) being *ashamed* of that *resolution* of that *Councel*, and imputing it to his *ambitious Clergie*, 1. he gives us not any *testimony* for this, onely saith, that in the *Acts of that Councel may be seen how tumultuary and unruly they were*. And to that *affirmation*, and that not very *pertinent* proof of it, I have two things to say, which indeed the *Acts* of that *Councel*, and the *Epistles* both of *Anatolius Bishop* of *Constantinople*, and *Leo Bishop* of *Rome* may assure us to have truth in them. 1. That if by being *ashamed* be meant *retracting* or *renouncing* this *resolution* of the *Councel*, It then hath no *truth* in it, that the *Patriarch* was *ashamed*.

9. For 1. it is so evident that of all *Leo*'s reprehensions in this matter of the *Primacy* adjudged him by that *Councel*, *Anatolius* chose to take no *notice*, and to return no answer, that *Leo* tells the *Emperor* of it, *Ep*: 59. *maluit prædictus Antistes meam gratulationem tacere, quam suam ambitum publicare*, and chargeth it upon *Anatolius* himself, that he made no *reply* to what he had said to him; *Ad quas cum non rescriberes ipse te à colloquii nostri consortio separâsti, by not making any return to my admonitory letters, thou hast thy self separated thy self from the communion of our discourse*. Ep:71.

10. 'Tis true indeed when *Leo* charged it upon him, as an act of *ambition* and *pride*, that he had procured that *Canon* to be made (as he doth at large, * *Ep*: 53. making it an *invasion* of the *Bishop* of *Alexandria* and *Antioch* his right setled by the *Councel* of *Nice*, and so in his * *Epistle* to *Martian* the *Emperour*, and + another to the *Empresse Pulcheria*) *Anatolius* writing to him upon occasion, tells him that the *Clergie* of the *Church* of *Constantinople*, and * not he, brought this mat-

* *Colon: Edit. fol. 118.*

* *Ep: 54 fol. 119.*

+ *Ep: 55. fol. 120.*

* *Culpam, quam de augendâ potestate, alienâ (ut asseris) adhortatione contraxeras, eis non ad sola Clericorum consilia transtulisses.* Leo. Ep: 71.

ter

ter before the *Councel*, and therefore *Leo* needed not be so *angry* with him, and complain so *sharply* against his *ambition*.

11. And this I suppose is it which this *Gentleman* must referre to, if there be the least *colour* of *truth* in his suggestion; But sure this disclaiming of *pride* or *ambition* in what was done, *regularly*, according to a long *continued custome*, and the *Canon* of the *Councel* of *Constantinople* is much more the *justifying* his *innocence*, than the *acknowledgment* of any *fault*, an act of *confidence* and *assurance*, no *indication* either of *guilt* or *shame*, no disowning the *dignity* confirmed to him by the *Councel*.

12. Many *evidences* there are in the *story* of those times that the *Bishop* of *Constantinople* did no way reject this *power* and *dignity*, which that *Councel* had confirmed to him; Tis annext to the *Acts* of that *Councel*, how he exercised it in an *eminent* manner on the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, *Leo* the *Emperour* having put wholly into his hands the judging of a great *affair*, and quieting a *disturbance* in that *Church*, see the * third part of that *Councel* of *Chalcedon*. In which matter may be observed that in the *Epistle* of the *Aegyptian Bishops*, and *Clergy* of *Alexandria*, in a *recitation* of the *Bishops* of the whole world, the *first* place being reserved to *Leo* the *Bishop* of *Rome*, the second is given * *Regiæ Constantinopolis Anatolio, to Anatolius of Constantinople the Royal seat*, and then follow *Basil* of *Antioch*, and *Juvenalis* of *Jerusalem*.

* *Edit: Paris: Tom: 3. p 504. &c.*

* *Ibid p. 506. B.*

13. And indeed if it be but remembred, 1. That what was done here at *Chalcedon* was for the main but the *reciting* and confirming what was done formerly at the *Councel* of *Constantinople* (a *judgment*, saith * *Euagrius*, that this matter was *well-ordered already*, ἐδικαίωθη τὴν Κωνσταντίνου πόλεως θρόνον εὐθὺς μετὰ τὴν Ῥώμης τετάχθαι, and what the *Bishop* of *Constantinople* held by *Custome* before that *Councel* also, * τὸ ἐκ πόλλου κρατῆσαν ἔθος, *a custome that had been long in force*, and * ἐκ τῆς παραλαβούσης συνθείας *by a precedaneous custome* &c. *Secondly*, that this was done by this *Councel* (if their *professions* may be believed) οὐ τοσοῦτον τῷ θρόνῳ Κωνσταντίνου πόλεως τὶ παρέχοντες, ὅσον τῆς μητροπόλεσι τὴν εὐταξίαν πρυτανεύοντες, *not so much to adde*

* *Lib. 2. in fine.*

* *Epist: Concil: Chal: ad Leon: Pap: Concil: t. 3. p. 475. B.*

* *subscript: Eleutherii Chalced: Ep: Ibid: p 46. F.*

adde any thing to the See of Constantinople, *as to provide for the quiet of other Metropoles in Asia, Pontus* and *Thracia. Thirdly*, that the *Councel* attested all this, and sent a *relation* of it to the *Bishop* of *Rome*, πεπεισμένοι καὶ τὰ τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἁγιωσύνῃ διδαχθέντων ἀποδέχεσθαι τε ταῦτα καὶ βεβαιοῦν, *being perswaded that he being rightly informed would receive and confirm it*, though his *Legates* had obstinately *opposed* it. *Fourthly*, That all the *objections*, which the *Pope* or his *Legates* had to it, were proposed and clearly answered in the * *Councel*; that of the *contrariety* of the *Canon* to the *decree* of the *Councel* of *Nice*, by *reading* that *Decree*, and shewing that it was perfectly *reconcileable* to it; That of *invading* the *rights* of the *Metropoles* of *Asia*, *Pontus* and *Thracia*, by the severall *Bishops* of those *regions* being examined by the *Emperours proxies*, whether they consented to it οἰκείᾳ γνώμῃ, ἢ ἀνάγκης τινὸς αὐτοῖς ἐπηρεχθείσης, *by their own will, or by any necessity imposed on them*, and their several *cheerful answers*, ἀπὸ γνώμης ὑπέγραψαν ὡς ἐνώπιον θεοῦ, *I subscribed willingly as in the presence of God*, and the like; To which if we adde the *depression* of the *Bishop* of *Antioch*, which * *Leo* objects, it is likewise answered by *Maximus* the *Bishop* of *Antioch* his *subscription* to this *Canon*. *Lastly*, that as this was enacted, by * *Baronius*'s own confession, by 600 *Bishops*, i. e. by the *whole Councel*, not onely by a party of it, So the *Bishop* of *Constantinople Anatolius* * subscribed it in the first place, and next after him the *Bishop* of *Antioch*, there will be no possibility of finding any *truth* in this *Gentleman*'s affirmation, that the *Patriarch* was *ashamed* of this *judgment* of the *Councel*.

* *Concil:* t. 3. p 460.

p. 461. D.

* *ad Maxim. Antioch: Ep:* 62. fol 124.

* *Tom: 6. An:* 454 *N.* 13. &c.

* p. 453.

14. It is much more reasonable to affirm on the other side, that the *Pope*, though not *Leo*, was *ashamed* of his *opposing* it, for within 30 years after, we finde *Felix* III. of his own accord consenting to his *Primacy*, and acknowledging *Acacius Bishop* of *Constantinople* to have power over the *Bishops* that were under him, *Ep:* 1. and *Innocent* III. confirms it with a solemn *constitution* cap: *Antiqua: de Privileg:* that I adde not the *establishment* of it again by the *Councel* of *Florence*, *sess: ult: in lit: Unionis*.

15. As for the *reason* which is here offered to *confirm* the truth of

of his *affirmation*, it hath it ſelf no *truth* in it, and ſo cannot be a *reaſon* of the *affirmation*. It is not *true*; for there was no *tumult* nor *unruline ſs* in the *Councel*, onely the *Pope's Legates* oppoſed the *Canon*, and made their *complaint* to the *Judges*, and were heard moſt *regularly* in all they could *pretend*, and at length the *Canon* was defined by the chearfull *conſent* of all but them. See the *ſtory* of it in *Binius*, πεφξ: ἑκκαιδεκ:

16. After the paſſing of the *Canon*, the *Legates*, *Paſchaſinus* and *Lucentius* make their addreſſe to the *Judges*, the Ἐνδοξότατοι ἄρχοντες, that ſupplied the *Emperours* place, who bad them ſpeak what they would have; They ſay, that *yeſterday*, *after the Judges and they were riſen*, *ſome things were done againſt the Canons*, *and deſire they may be read*. That was appointed to be done; but firſt *Aetius Archdeacon* of *Conſtantinople* makes a *relation*, how after matters of *faith* agreed on, they proceeded according to the *manner* to ſome *conſtitutions*, in theſe they deſired the *Legates* to *joyn* with them, they *refuſed* ſaying, they had *received* cōmands from *Rome* to do ſo, which being *remonſtrated* to the *Judges* they had bid the *Councel proceed*, and hereupon the *Councel* had *unanimouſly decreed*; Appealing to them all, whether it were not true, nothing being done ἐν παραβύσῳ ἢ κλόπης τρόπῳ, *clancularly or by ſtealth*, but πρόξει, ἀκολούθῳ καὶ κανονικῇ, *of courſe*, *regularly and canonically*. Then the *Canon* was read, being a plain *recitation* of what was before done in the *Councel* of *Conſtantinople*, and then all the *ſubſcriptions* follow. Then the *Legates* deſire it may be *inquired*, whether none have *ſubſcribed* by *force*, ſuggeſting that the *Conſtantinopolitan Canon* was *contrary* to the *Nicene*; Thereupon the *Canons* were both *read*, and upon the *Judges* appointment, they that were moſt *concerned*, the *Biſhops* of *Aſia*, *Pontus*, and *Thracia*, who were now brought under the *Patriarchate* of *Conſtantinople*, being ſuppoſed formerly to be *free*, were called out *ſeverally* and asked whether they had *acted* under any *force*, and they ſeverally profeſſe the *contrary*. Whereupon the *Judges* ſumme up the buſineſs and conclude, that they had *weighed* all, and found that none had *injury*, the *priviledges* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome* were *preſerved* intire

p. 463.

intire according to the *Canons*, and that the *Biſhop* of *new Rome*, *Conſtantinople*, was to have *equal priviledges* with *him*, &c And this being their *ſenſe*, they deſire the whole *Councel* to deliver *theirs*, and they all cried out, αὐτὴ δικαία ψήφος, ταῦτα πάντες λέγομεν, ταῦτα πᾶσιν ἀρέσκει, αὐτὴ δικαία κρίσις, τὰ τυπωθέντα κεκρίσθω. *This is a juſt ſentence. This we all ſay, let this be conſigned* and *confirmed*, deſiring they may now be *diſmiſs'd* every man to his *home*, and ſo the *Judges pronounce*, Πάντα ἡ σύνοδος ἐκύρωσε, *The Synod hath confirmed all.*

17. No diſſent of any but of the *Legates*, and that, it ſeems, went for *nothing* when the *reſt* ſo *univerſally conſented*; ſo farre is this *ſuggeſtion* from all *ſhew* of *truth*, that the *Clergy* of *Conſtantinople* were *tumultuary* and *unruly*.

18. If any the leaſt *unrulineſs* there were, it was on the *Legate's* part, who would thus *ſtand* out and *complain* without the *leaſt* reaſon to doe ſo, not on the *Councels*, which proceeded according to the *precedent* cuſtome and *Canon*, and ſuch grounds to which neither the *Pope* nor his *Legate* did then ſo much as *object* any thing, *viz:* the ſame *title* by which *Rome* it ſelf aſcended to her *greatneſs*, * by being the *Imperial city*.

* διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην.

Sect. IV.

The Popes judging in his own cauſe. His Legates ſuffrages in Councels, Of what neceſſity. Antioch's *equality to* Rome. Conſtantinople *preferred to no more but a Patriarchy. The dignity of the Biſhop of* Rome *meerly from* Rome's *being the Imperial city.*

Num. 1. IN this matter of that *Councel* of *Chalcedon two* exceptions more he offers (which are not ſo *weighty* but they may be put together) in theſe words,

2. *Secondly, he caviſleth at the privilege of Supreme Magiſtracy, calling it a method of ſecurity beyond all amulets: then he tells us of* Antioch's *being equal to* Rome, *and that* Conſtantinople *deſired but the ſame privileges, againſt the very nature of the ſtory; for* Conſtantinople *being then a Patriarchy, if that*

that made it equal to Rome, *as this Doctor feigneth, what did it pretend* ἴσα πρεσβεῖα *for? ſeeing the Doctor aſſumes before that all Patriarchs were equall, neither* Rome *it ſelf, and leſſe* Antioch *had cauſe to complain.*

3. For the former of theſe, which he calls my *cavilling at the privilege of ſupreme Magiſtracy*, that ſure is but *gratis dictum*, and a *begging* of that, which in the whole *controverſie* he knows to be moſt *denied* him.

4. That he, that *aſſumes* a *ſupreme Magiſtracy* to himſelf, ſhould by no means be *concluded* to be an *aſſumer*, till he make his own *confeſſion* of it, and give his *ſuffrage* to his *condemnation*, I mentioned, and cannot but look upon ſtill, as a *method* of *perfect ſecurity*, beyond all *amulets* and *defenſatives*; For how can it be imagined, that he, that *conteſts* a right, ſhould at the ſame time *acknowledge* it not to belong to him, when he knows that nothing but this *confeſſion* is ſufficient to *deprive* him of it? As for any ſuch *priviledge* belonging to *ſupreme Magiſtracy* in *generall*, or any way applicable to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, in relation to a *General Councel*, it may be worth conſidering a while.

5. And firſt for *ſupreme Magiſtracy* in *general*, This *privilege* doth not extend to all matters. In a *conteſt* of *particular* right between a *ſupreme Magiſtrate* and a *ſubject*, brought before any *legal judicature*, 'tis certain the *ſupreme Magiſtrate* may be *concluded* without his own *ſuffrage* or *conſent*, and agreeable to that it was, when the *queſtion* was brought in this *Councel* before the *Judges* by the complaint of the *Pope's Legates*, whether the *Canon* were the day before, after the *Legate's* departure, duly paſſed or no, For if it were not ſo, what needed this *complaint* to the *Iudges*, the bare *abſence*, and ſo *not conſenting* of the *Legates* had been ſufficient to *caſſate* and *annull* the *Acts*: Whatſoever *Magiſtracy* therefore was then pretended to by the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, this *Privilege* doth not then ſeem to have belonged to it, that his, or his *Legate's ſuffrages* ſhould be neceſſary to the paſſing every *Canon*.

6. That they might have *liberty* to come to the *Councell*, that nothing were done *clancularly* or by *ſtealth*, at a time when

they *knew* not of it, that no *force* were uſed on thoſe that were *preſent*, nor the like to hinder the *preſence* of any, this was neceſſary to the *freedome*, and ſo to the very being of a *Councel*, and conſequently to the *validity* of every *act* thereof, and accordingly on theſe heads it was that the *Legates* in their complaint to the *Iudges* inſiſted (and ſo doth * *Baronius*, ſtyling that *laſt Action* of that *Councel*, *ſpuriam & clandeſtinam*, *& ab* Anatolio *furtim adjectam*, *a ſpurious clandeſtine action ſtollen in by* Anatolius) as alſo, on the *authority* of the *Nicene Canons*, which they pretended to be infringed by that latter of *Conſtantinople*, on which this of *Chalcedon* was *founded*, and this they thought ſufficient to *caſſate* this *Act*, but for this of the want of the *Pope*'s or his *Legate*'s *ſuffrage*, that it ſhould *invalidate* that *decree*, it is not ſo much as pretended by the *Legates*, in the *relations* of the *paſſages* of that *Councel*.

* *Tom. 6. Ann:* 451. *Num:* 143.

7. And therefore according to that ſaying of S. *Hierome*, put into their *Canon Law*, *ſi authoritas quæritur, orbis major eſt urbe*, *if authority be looked for, the whole world is more than the one city of* Rome, it is the reſolution of * *Almain*, *merito Concilium Chalcedonenſe Leoni reſiſtenti prævaluiſſe*, that the *Councel of Chalcedon did well* in *ſtanding* out againſt *Pope Leo*, and did *juſtly prevail* againſt him.

Decret: par: 1. diſt: 193. c. Legimus.
* *de author: Eccl: 7.*

8. This *amulet* it ſeems had not virtue to ſtand him in ſo much ſtead, as * *Baronius* is pleaſed to *phanſie*, ſetting out the *power* and *greatneſs* of *Pope Leo* by this, that he did alone *caſſate* what this *Councel* had *decreed by the ſuffrages of* 600 *Biſhops*. Which how well it conſiſts with his former *affirmation*, that this *Canon* was *ſpurious* and *clandeſtine*, and *ſtollen* in by *Anatolius*, I ſhall not here examine. 'Tis ſure, if the *Popes authority* were ſo *ſoveraign*, the act needed not have been made *ſpurious* firſt, to qualifie it for the *caſſation*. But this of the *power* or *ſuperiority* of a *Pope* over an *OEcumenical Councel*, is a queſtion not ſo neceſſary here to be debated, unleſſe what this *Gentleman* was pleaſed to mention of the *privilege of ſupreme Magiſtracy*, had been indevoured ſome way to be *proved* by him.

* *Ann:* 454. *Num:* 13. &c.

9. Next he quarrels my ſaying that *Antioch* was *equall* to *Rome*,

Rome, and that *Conſtantinople deſired but the ſame privileges*, and this he ſaith is *againſt the very nature of the ſtory*.

10. That *Antioch* had the ἴσα πρεσβεῖα *equal privileges* with *Rome*, ſo farre as to the *dignity* of a *Patriarchate* &c. (allowing to *Rome* the *Primacy* of *order* and *dignity*) I thought was competently concluded from the *Pope*'s pretenſions againſt that *Canon* of *Chalcedon*, making it an *invaſion* of the *rights* of *Antioch*, and as *derogatory* to that as to *Rome*; And ſo ſtill it ſeems to me, For if *Antioch* had not ἴσα πρεσβεῖα *equal privileges* with *Rome*, how could *Conſtantinople*'s aſpiring to *equal privileges* with *Rome*, be as derogatory to *Antioch* as to *Rome*? But I need not this help from *Pope Leo*'s argument, the thing aſſerted by me, is not denied, that I know of, by any *Romaniſt*, viz: that *Antioch* had the dignity of a *Patriarchate*, for that is all that I expreſſe my ſelf to mean by *Antioch*'s having ἴσα πρεσβεῖα *equal privileges* with *Rome*, and I that maintain (as this *Gentleman* truely ſaith I doe) that all *Patriarchs* are *equal* (in reſpect of *Power*, differing onely in *order* or *precedence*) cannot be imagined to mean any thing elſe by it.

11. So again that *Conſtantinople* deſired no more but the *privileges* of a *Patriarch*, and that that is the meaning of the ἴσα πρεσβεῖα *equal privileges*, is by me ſaid in *oppoſition* to acquiring any *ordinary juriſdiction* over other *Churches*, and this inſtead of being *contrary* to the nature of the *ſtory*, is directly agreeable to the whole *courſe* of it, and to the expreſſe words of the *Canon*, which defines, that as the *city* of *Conſtantinople* was honoured with the *Empire* and *Senate*, and injoyed *equal privileges* with *old Imperial Rome*, ſo the *Church* of *Conſtantinople* (ὡς ἐκείνῃ μεγαλοπρεπῶς) *ſhould be exalted to the ſame height with that*, τὰ πρεσβεῖα μετ' ἐκείνην κατέχουσαν, *having the next place after it*, adding that the *Metropolitans* (and none elſe) of *Aſia*, *Pontus* and *Thracia*, &c. ſhould be ordained by the *Biſhop* of *Conſtantinople*, the *Biſhops* of each of thoſe *Provinces* being left to be *ordained* by their reſpective *Metropolitans*; This is ſo plain that there can be no need of farther *proof* of it.

12. And for this *Gentleman*'s *objection*, by way of *Queſtion*,

that *Constantinople* being then a *Patriarchy*, if that made it equal with *Rome*, for what did it pretend ἴσα πρεσβεῖα, I answer 1. that *Constantinople* being by *custome*, and by *Act* of the *Councel* held in that *city*, a *Patriachate* already, it sought not to *acquire* any *new* advantage or increase by this *Canon* of *Chalcedon*, but onely to continue what already it had.

13. This again appears by the *story*, where that *Canon* of *Constantinople* was produced and read, as the *foundation* on which this *new Canon* was *built*, and so by the expresse words in the beginning of the *Canon*, Παυλαχοῦ τοῖς ἁγίων πατέρων ὅροις ἑπόμενοι &c. *following constantly the definitions of the Holy Fathers, and knowing the Canon* newly read *of the* 150 *Bishops assembled in the reign of the Emperour* Theodosius *at the Imperial city* Constantinople *or new* Rome. And agreeably *Evagrius* sets down the *story*, that in this *Councel* of *Chalcedon* ἐδικαίωθη *it was thought just* or *determined* that the *Constantinopolitan See* εὐθὺς μετὰ τὴν Ῥώμης τελέχθαι *was rightly* and *duly placed next after* Rome.

14. And when this *Gentleman* assumes, that if this were so, the *neither* Rome *it self, and lesse* Antioch *had cause to complain*, I shall most willingly joyn with him in it, being no way obliged by my *pretensions* to justifie the *Pope* or his *Legates* dislike to that *Canon*. And for *Antioch* I am sure enough that the *Bishop* thereof, *Maximus*, though he had received an *Epistle* from the *Pope* to *exasperate* and *perswade* him to stand upon his *right*, did very readily *subscribe* it, setting his name and *consent* next after the *Bishop* of *Constantinople*, as hath formerly been set down out of the *story*.

15. And if *Antioch* did so, who was the *loser* by it, if *precedence* signifie any thing, I confesse I can render no cause (unlesse it be the *Pompejúsve parem*, *impatience* of any *equal*) why the *Bishop* of *Rome*, who lost not so much as *precedence* by this *advancement* or confirmation of *dignity* to the *Bishop* of *Constantinople*, should be so *obstinately* and implacably offended at it.

16. Thus have I answered every *attempt* and *tittle* of *exception* offered by this *Gentleman* in this matter, and have now leisure to *complain*, that the one thing that I desired to be taken notice

notice of from this *Canon*, is not ſo much as conſidered, or at all replied to by him, *viz:* that *the Dignity that old* Rome *had by antient Canons injoyed* was given it upon this account, διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην becauſe *Rome* was the *Imperial ſeat*; which as it is the proof of my whole *pretenſion*, that the *Pope* was not *Univerſal Paſtor*, upon title of his *ſucceſſion* from S. *Peter*, (for if whatſoever he had, the *Councels* gave it him, οἱ πατέρες ἀπέδωκαν, ſaith the *Canon*, and gave it him as *Biſhop* of the *Imperial See*, then ſure 'twas no *inheritance* from S. *Peter*) ſo it was truely obſerved out of the *ſtory* of the *Councel* of *Chalcedon*, and may be ſeen both in the *Legate's complaint* to the *Judges*, and in the *Epiſtles* of *Leo* to the *Emperour Martianus*, the *Empreſſe Pulcheria*, *Anatolius Biſhop* of *Conſtantinople* and *Maximus* of *Antioch*, and his *inſtructions* to his *Legates*, that he never made any *exception* to that branch of the *Canon* that thus derived the *original* of his *greatneſſe* from the *Imperial dignity* of the *city*, never thought himſelf injured by *this* way of ſetting down his *title*.

Sect. V.

Of the Canon of Epheſus. *The power of Metropolitans, of Primates. The caſe of the Archbiſhop of* Cyprus *no peculiar caſe. The deduction thence againſt the Popes Univerſal Paſtorſhip. Of the Popes tenure by the inſtitution of Chriſt.*

Num. 1. THE next *exception* concerns the *Canon* of the *Councel* of *Epheſus*, thus,

2. *As for the Canon of* Epheſus *touching the Archbiſhop of* Cyprus, *it plainly ſheweth that the Metropolitans were ſubordinate to the Patriarchs, ſeeing this caſe of* Cyprus *was a peculiar excepted caſe, the reaſon given doth ſhew that the ſuperiority of Patriarchs was by cuſtome received from their Anceſtors, contrary to that which the Doctor before affirmed, however it is ſtill nothing to the purpoſe, becauſe the authority, which we ſay belongs to the Pope, is neither Patriarchal, nor derived from any inſtitution or cuſtome of the Church, but from the inſtitution of Chriſt.* Sect. 6.

3. This *Canon* of *Epheſus*, ſaith he, *plainly ſhews that Metropolitans were ſubordinate to Patriarchs, ſeeing this of* Cyprus *was a peculiar excepted caſe.* To this I ſee not how any *pretenſions* of ours oblige me to make any *return*, yet becauſe it may be *ſubject* to ſome *miſtake* for want of *explicating*, I ſhall clear that whole matter by theſe *three Propoſitions.*

4. *Firſt*, that the *controverſie*, which occaſioned that *Canon*, was this, Whether the *Biſhop of Conſtance*, *Metropolitan* of the *Province* of *Cyprus*, was to be *ordained* by the *Patriarch* of *Antioch*, or (without ſeeking *abroad*) by his own *Synod*, the *Biſhops* of *Cyprus*. Thus is the ſtate of the *queſtion* ſet down in the *Councels*, *Tom.*2. p.670. at the *beginning* of the 7 *Action. Diſcuſſa eſt controverſia inter Rheginum Epiſcopum Conſtantiæ Cypri, & Johannem Antiochenum, qui ſibi Cyprias Eccleſias ſubdere moliebatur. The controverſie was diſcuſſed between* Rheginus *Biſhop of* Conſtance *of* Cyprus, *and* John *of* Antioch, *who endevoured to bring the Cypriotes Churches into ſubjection to himſelf.*

5. *Secondly*, that the *antient cuſtome* had been favourable to *Rheginus* his *pretenſion*, and ſo the claim of *Antioch* is defined πρόσθμα παρὰ τὰς ἐκκλησιαστικὰς θεσμὰς— καινοτομοῦμενον, *a thing innovated againſt the Eccleſiaſtical Lawes*, and ſo τῶν πάντων ἐλευθερίας ἀπλοῦν, that which, by the *example*, or *preſident*, *would concern the liberty of all Churches.* Cod: Can: Eccl: Un: ꝓon.

6. *Thirdly*, that the *Councel* defined on the *Cypriots* ſide, that according to the *Canons*, and *antient cuſtome*, the *Biſhops* of *Cyprus* ſhould *retein* their *privilege inviolable*, δι' ἑαυτῶν τὰς χειροτονίας τῶν ὁσιωτάτων ἐπισκόπων ποιούμενοι, *ordaining their Biſhops within, and by themſelves*, and conſequently that it was an *act* of *aſſuming*, and *invaſion* in the *Biſhop* of *Antioch*, to claim τὰς ἐν Κύπρῳ ποιεῖσθαι χειροτονίας *to make any Ordinations within* Cyprus. And what was thus adjudged in the caſe of the *Cypriots*, was by that *Councel* in the ſame *Canon* thought fit to be *extended* in like manner to all other *Provinces* (τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων διοικήσεων, καὶ τῶν ἀπανταχοῦ ἐπαρχιῶν παρὰ φυλαχθήσεται, *the ſame ſhall be obſerved alſo through all Dioceſes and Provinces every where*) ὥστε μηδένα &c. *that no Biſhop ſhall*

ſhall meddle with another Province, which hath not from the beginning been under him, i. e. *under his predeceſſors power.* And ſo there is no truth in what is here ſuggeſted, that this of *Cyprus* was a *peculiar excepted caſe*; It certainly, by the expreſſe words of the *Canon*, belonged to *all other Metropolitans* and their *Provinces* over all the world, that neither *Biſhop* of *Antioch* nor of *Rome* was to meddle with any *ordinations* except in their own *particular Provinces*, but the *Synod* of the *Biſhops* of each *Province*, δι' ἑαυτῶν τὰς χειροτονίας ἐπισκόπων ποιεῖσθαι, *to make the ordinations of their Biſhops by themſelves.*

7. What he adds of the *ſuperiority* of *Patriarchs* by *cuſtome* received from their *Anceſtors*, *Firſt*, that the reaſon given in that *Epheſine Canon* doth ſhew it; *Secondly*, that it is *contrary* to that which the *Doctor before affirmed*; *Thirdly*, that it is ſtill nothing to the *purpoſe* in hand, of the *authority* of the *Pope*; hath not, that *I* can diſcern, any *truth* in any part of it. For as to the *firſt*, whatſoever *ſuperiority Patriarchs* be acknowledged to have, there is no word of mention concerning it in that *Canon*, neither was there any *occaſion* to define any thing of it; It was the *Synod*, and *Biſhops* of *Cyprus* their right, that was *invaded*, and of that onely that *Canon* ſpeaks, devolving it to *original* cuſtome, and *Canons*, and ſo for all other *Metropolitans*. But that is not the *ſuperiority* of *Patriarchs*. *Secondly*, for my *affirmation*, certainly it was never ſuch as could be *deemed contrary* either to that *Epheſine Canon* about *ordination* of their *Metropolitans*, or that due *ſuperiority*, which by *Canons* or *cuſtomes* doth belong to *Primates* or *Patriarchs*; what this is I have often ſet down, and need not again repeat it.

8. *Laſtly*, for the application of this *Canon* to the preſent affair of the *Univerſal Paſtorſhip* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, thus much is evident, *Firſt*, that all *Provinces* every where, αἱ ἁπαλαχοῦ ἐπαρχίαι were concluded by this *Canon*, that they ſhould *ordain* their *Biſhops* within themſelves, and then I pray how can the χειροτονία *power* of *ordaining* all belong to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, and *ordination* and *juriſdiction* going together, how can he have the *Univerſal Juriſdiction*, or which is all one the *Univerſal Paſtorſhip*?

Secondly,

9. *Secondly*, if the *Pope* his *authority* be not *Patriarchal*, as this *Gentleman* here saith, then till he hath proved that it is more than *Patriarchal*, and answered all that is said to the *contrary* in that *Tract* of *Schisme*, that which is by the *Ephesine Canon* judged in order to the *Patriarch* of *Antioch*, will also *conclude* him.

10. And *thirdly*, that which is held by the *institution* of *Christ* being certainly derived ἀπ' ἀρχῆς *from the beginning*, must needs be included in the words of this *Canon*, which requires that all should remain, as by *custome* (immemorial) *from the beginning* it had been, to which therefore we appeal, and inquire, whether *Cyprus* was not as *Independent* from *Rome* at that time, as from *Antioch*; if not, how any such *dependance* at that time appears, or how is it imaginable there should be any such, when all *Provinces* every where were to be *ruled* and ordered δι' ἐαυτῶν *by their own Synod* and *Bishops*.

11. As for the *tenure*, by which the *Pope* is now, in the close of this *Paragraph*, clearly said to stand, not *from any institution or custome of the Church, but from the institution of Christ*. *First*, this is more than ever this *Gentleman* would acknowledge before, telling us p. 14. that *who understands the Principles of the Catholick faith, knows they relie not onely upon such places of Scripture, as, Thou art* Peter, and *Feed my sheep*, From whence I thought my self obliged to conclude they *relied* not *onely* on *Christ* his *institution*, for that I suppose must be set down in some, and if in any, sure in *those Scriptures*,
p. 10. And in another place, that I *forget my self when I think a Catholick ought to prove that the Pope hath an Universal Primacie* (referring all to his *Possession*) whereas in case he pretend to hold by the *institution* of *Christ* (as here he saith) certainly he is obliged to produce that *institution*, and that is to prove his *pretension*.

12. But then *secondly*, that there is indeed any such thing, that the *Pope* holds by *Institution* of *Christ*, is still the thing denied by us, and the contrary, I think, demonstrated in the former *chapter*, and all the places producible for it, answered, and so it must not be here *begged* or assumed, without any word added for the *proof* of it.

Sect.

Sect. VI.

The exemption of Juſtiniana prima, *The ſeveral exceptions againſt this inſtance anſwered.*

num. 1. HIS next *Paragraph* pretends to be *anſwer* to the *evidence* brought from the *example* of *Juſtiniana prima*, which was by the *Emperour* made *independent* from any other *Eccleſiaſtical* power. His anſwer is this,

2. *Then he goes on with two examples, in which he would perſwade us that* Juſtiniana prima, *and* Carthage *were made exempt cities by the Emperour, and ſeeth not that his own inſtance giveth the anſwer, for as in the temporal donation, he doth not exempt them from his own ſubjection, ſo neither from the Popes in ſpiritual, nor as much as giveth them the ſtyle of Patriarchs; though the Biſhop of* Conſtantinople *in his own city ordinarily had it.*

3. That *Juſtiniana prima* was by *Juſtinian* exempted from all others (and ſo from the *Biſhop* of *Rome* his) *Juriſdiction* (and ſo *Carthage* alſo, being inveſted with the ſame *privileges*) I thought ſufficiently proved by the plain words of the *conſtitution*, that for any differences that ſhould befall in that *Province*, the *Archbiſhop* of that new erection from time to time, ſhould decide them finally, *nec ad alium quendam eatur*, and *they ſhould go to no other* for *deciſion*, or by way of *appeal*. and ſo in the *Novell*, ἔχειν ὑπὸ τὸν ἰδίαν δικαιοδοσίαν τὰς ὑπηκόους &c. he ſhall *have under his own juriſdiction the Biſhops of Dacia*, &c. which what is it, but a perfect *exemption* and *independency*?

4. The ſame appears alſo by the other part of the *conſtitution*, that concerning *ordination* of that *Archbiſhop*, It was, as was ſaid, to be done by his *own Synod* of *Metropolitans*. To which agrees that of the *Novell* 131. Αὐτόνομος ὑπὸ τῆς οἰκείας συνόδου χειροτονεῖσθω *He muſt be ordained by his own Synod.*

5. To this the anſwer given here, *and given*, ſaith he, *by my own inſtance*, is no more than this, that as in the *temporal donation he doth not exempt them from his own ſubjection, ſo neither from the Popes in ſpiritual.* But ſure there is no force

in this *comparison*; For the *not exempting* him in *temporal* things from his own *power*, doth no way conclude a *non-exemption* from the *Pope*; When *Henry* VIII. removed the *Papal* power out of this nation, no man thinks he divested himself of the *regal*; the *Archbishop* of *Canterbury* was made *Independent*, and *exempt* from the *Bishop* of *Rome*, but remained still *subordinate* to the *King*: So in like manner *Justinian* might doe, make *Justiniana* a *Primacy*, and yet leave the *Bishop* and his whole *Province* in the same *subjection* to the *Emperour*, that before it had been; And as this is very possible, so if it were not the plain truth of the *fact*, that must be made appear by the *story*, or by the *investiture*.

6. In that there is no sound of any word for the *exempting* that *Bishop* from the *Imperial subjection*, and so we cannot imagine, without any *ground*, that there was any such thing, but for *Ecclesiastical judicature* and *ordination*, they are both distinctly specified, that he and his *Metropolitans* should have them within themselves, without fetching them abroad from any other; and so by that the *Bishop* of *Rome* is explicitly excluded from having any thing to doe there.

7. This farther appears, not onely by the matter of *fact*, for after the *first Archbishop* was ordained by *Pope Vigilius*, his *successors* were constantly *ordained* by their own *Metropolitans*, and not by the *Bishop* of *Rome*, but also by farther expresse words in the **Novell*, ἐν αἷς δὲ αὐτοῖς ὑποκείμεναι αὐτῷ ἐπαρχίαις τὸν ἐπίσκοπον αὐτὸν τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Ῥώμης θείνυ, *In the Provinces subject to him he shall hold the place of the Apostolical seat of* Rome, *i. e.* doe all within those *Provinces* that the *Bishop* of *Rome* was wont to doe, before this *Primacy* was erected, and this, it seems, by direct *consent* of *Vigilius* then *Pope*, as there it follows, κατὰ τὰ διαδήλα ὑπὸ τῆς ἁγίας Πάπα Βιγιλίν, *according to what was defined by the Holy Father* Vigilius.

* Νεαρ. ρλα'.

8. Which words if they be conceived to denote no more than a *deputation* from the *Pope* by which this *power* was held, and so be made use of as an *argument* to inferre his *continued* dependence on the *See* of *Rome*, that will be found to be a mistake, the whole *investiture* giving the *Archbishop* there an αὐτοκεφαλία a perfect *freedome*, and *absolutenesse*, to be *head* within

within his *Province, independent* from all others. And ſhould it by any other way appear that *Vigilius*, who *ordained* the firſt *Biſhop* there (as 'tis ſure he muſt be ordained by *ſome* body, and none fitter for it than the *Biſhop* of *old Rome*) did farther give him a *deputation*, as I ſee it affirmed (but not by this *Gentleman*) both of *Vigilius*, and after him of *Gregory*, yet certainly this was but a *formality*, without any farther *effect* or *influence* on the *inveſtiture*, the *privileges* of that *See* came to it meerly by the *Act* of the *Emperour* (and that *Act* was entred a part of the *Imperial Law*) to which the ſuppoſed *addition* of the *Pope's deputation* can be no *prejudice*; And *ſecondly*, the *Biſhop* of *Carthage*, which by that *Conſtitution* is inveſted with the very ſame *privileges* by the *Emperour*, is not pretended to have received any ſuch *deputation* from the *Pope*, and yet by virtue of the *Emperours* act was freed from all *former dependence*, and injoyed the προνόμιον and δικαιὸν μητροπολιτικὸν the *privilege* of a *Metropolitan*, in the ſame manner, as *Iuſtiniana* did.

9. What this *Gentleman* adds, that the *Emperour* gave not ſo much as the *ſtyle* of *Patriarch* to the *Biſhop* of *Iuſtiniana*, *though the Biſhop of* Conſtantinople *in his own city ordinarily had it*, will ſoon appear to ſignifie nothing; For *firſt*, the *power*, not the *title* is that we ſpeak of, and that may be had in *plenitude*, without the name; the *Archbiſhop* of *Cyprus* was by the *Councel* of *Epheſus* adjudged to have all power within himſelf, ſo as to go neither to *Antioch* nor to *Rome* for it, and yet was not raiſed to any higher title, than that of *Archbiſhop*.

10. *Secondly*, I ſuppoſe *Primate* and *Patriarch* to be perfectly all one, as to matter of *power* and *dignity*; that the *Archbiſhops* of *Conſtantinople* and *Hieruſalem*, ſo ſtyled in the *antient Canons*, were yet ordinarily called *Patriarchs*, was no injury to the *Patriarch* of *Antioch*, ſaith *Theod: Balſamon*, himſelf *Patriarch* of *Antioch* in his μελέτη περὶ Πατριαρχ: προνομ: διὰ τὴν ταυτότητα τῆς τίμης, *becauſe of the identity of the honour*. And accordingly in the *Councels* the *Archbiſhop* of *Conſtantinople*, under that title is placed before the *Patriarch* of *Antioch*, yea and of *Alexandria*, who yet by the

θεῖαι καὶ ἁγίαι γραφαὶ *divine and holy writings* (i. e. the *Canons*) by the πάτριοι παραδόσεις *traditions of the Fathers*, was ſtyled *Pope*, ſaith *Balſamon*. And therefore for *Juſtiniana* alſo this was ſufficient; It was made a *Primacy*, and then it matters not, though it were not ſtyled a *Patriarchy*; The *exemption* from *Rome* and all other forreign power is all I pretend this *city* had, and of that there can be no *queſtion*, whatſoever title belonged to it.

11. *Thirdly*, this *Gentleman*'s ſaying that the *Biſhop* of *Conſtantinople* had the *title* of *Patriarch in his own city*, would make one believe that he had it not *elſewhere*, which yet it is notorious that he had, Παλαιάρχας ἀναμφιλέκτους; he and the *Archbiſhop* of *Jeruſalem* were *publickly called Patriarchs*, ſaith *Balſamon*, and he renders the reaſon, διὰ τὸ ἐπέχειν τὰς πέντε παλαιάρχας τοπὸν τῆς μιᾶς κεφαλῆς τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἁγίων ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ, *becauſe the five Patriarchs* (of which number they were *two*) *held the place of the head of the body, to wit, of the holy Churches of God.* But whatſoever the *title* were, it is ſtill ſure enough it had the *power* and *dignity* of a *Patriarchate*, firſt by *cuſtome*, then by *Canons* of *two General Councels*, *Conſtantinople* and *Chalcedon* (for I ſuppoſe the ſetting it next and *equal* to *Rome*, and before *Antioch* and *Alexandria*, will amount to this) alſo by that very *Novell* of *Juſtinian*, where the *privileges* are conferred on *Juſtiniana*, Τὸν μακαριώτατον Ἀρχιεπίσκοπον Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τῆς νέας Ῥώμης δευτέραν τάξιν ἐπέχειν μετὰ τὸν ἁγιώτατον ἀποστολικὸν θρόνον τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης, καὶ ἀλλῶν πάντων προτιμᾶσθαι, *the Archbiſhop of new* Rome, Conſtantinople, *hath the next place after the Apoſtolical See of old* Rome, *and the precedence of honour before all others.* And ſo much for the *Exceptions* to the *fift Chapter*.

Νεαρ. ϛλα'.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

An Anſwer to the Exceptions made to the ſixt Chapter.

Sect. I.

The plea for the Popes power from the converſion of England. *Of acquiring of right by two titles.*

Num. 1. THE plea from *plantation*, which was *conſidered* in the *ſixt Chapter*, he now proceeds to, in theſe words,

2. *In his ſixt Chapter he examineth another title peculiar to* England, viz: *that our Nation was converted by miſſion from* Rome, *and this is totally beſide the queſtion, for no man is ſo* Sect. 1. *ſtupid as to pretend S.* Peter *or the Church of* Rome *to have power over the Univerſal Church, becauſe his ſucceſſors converted* England: *But ſome pretend a ſpecial title of gratitude, the violation of which aggravateth the ſin of ſchiſmatizing from the Church of Rome in our nation, yet no man, as farre as I can underſtand, thinks this latter obligation of ſo high a nature, as that for no occaſion or never ſo great cauſe, it may not be diſpenſed with, but onely preſſe it then when the benefit is ſlighted, or by colourable arguments to the contrary unworthily avoided: And yet this Doctor quite miſtaking the Queſtion frameth an* Sect. 2. *argument, as full of words as empty of matter, affirming there cannot be two ſucceſſive titles to poſſeſſion of the ſame thing, telling us, that he who claimeth a reward as of his own labour and travel muſt diſclaim a donation, &c. if any paſſed before, and that if a King have right by deſcent, he cannot claim any thing by conqueſt, by which you may ſee his underſtanding the Law is not much more than his underſtanding of our principles.*

3. What this *Gentleman* here premiſeth, that this *plea* from the *Converſion* of this *nation* by *miſſion* from *Rome* is not uſed

by the *Romaniſt* to prove us *ſchiſmaticks*, I have no reaſon to confute, but ſhall from thence ſuppoſe that that *ſixt Chapter* might have been ſpared out of that little *Treatiſe*, and our *Church* competently juſtified by the *precedent Chapters*; And then all that I ſhall need adde, is, *Firſt*, that I hope what was by me added *ſuperfluouſly*, above the neceſſities of our cauſe, will not deſtroy what was before ſaid *pertinently*, and then as I ſhall onely have loſt my *pains*, and there is no farther *hurt* done, ſo it muſt needs be very *unneceſſary* for this *Gentleman* to adapt any farther *anſwers* to that *ſixt Chapter*, when he hath once adjudged all that is there ſaid to be totally beſide the *Queſtion*.

4. *Secondly*, That if others had been as *prudent*, as this *Gentleman*, I had certainly ſpared that *Chapter*, It being no intereſt of mine to invent *pleas* for the *Romaniſt*, and although, as this *Gentleman* hath pleaſed to ſet it, it be a competent ſtupidity, and that which I never thought any *Romaniſt* guilty of, to make the *converſion* of *England* a *plea* to *power over the Univerſal Church*, yet *England*, and not the *Univerſal Church*, being the ſubject of our *Queſtion*, there is not quite ſo much *ſtupidity* in it, to plead the *Popes* power over *England* from the *ſuppoſed Converſion* of *England*, And certainly I did not dream that ſome *Romaniſts* have thus *pleaded*, but, as I ſaid before, if this *Gentleman* will not inſiſt on it, neither ſhall I farther *importune* him about it.

5. For that of *gratitude* which he now mentions onely as an *aggravation* of the ſin of *ſchiſmatizing*, wch that we are guilty of, he acknowledges muſt be proved by ſome other means, I yeild to the force of it, that it might juſtly adde a *weight* to the obligation, which formerly lay upon us, ſuppoſing any ſuch there were, but cannot lay an *obligation* to *obedience* where before it was not due, much leſſe were it due unto *another*. All the benefits that can be heaped on me by any man that gives me not my being, cannot *oblige* or *engage* my *ſubjection* to him, without the *intervenience* of my own *conſent*, if I am perfectly free to chooſe my *Sovereign*, and without the conſent of my former *Sovereign*, if I have any.

6. So that the whole *Queſtion* muſt be, whether by any *original*

ginal right the *Biſhop* of *Rome* had power over this *Kingdome*, and ſo whether by that, our *obedience* was due to him, for if it were, then this *gratitude* was not the *tenure*, but that other; and if it were not, then neither of the *titles* are in force againſt us; not the firſt, which hath no *beeing*; nor the ſecond, which whatſoever it be, obligeth not to *obedience*.

7. This I thought was apparent by the *inſtance* of the ſeveral *claims* to a *Kingdome*, by *deſcent*, and by *conqueſt*, the one of which, if it ſtood, as the *title*, ſuperſedeth the other, he that holds by *inheritance*, cannot be properly ſaid to hold by *conqueſt*, even when it is true that he hath *conquered* alſo. For in that caſe, when the right heir being forced to make uſe of his *ſword* to give him *poſſeſſion*, is *ſucceſsfull* and *victorious* in it, all that his *ſword* doth, is to give him *poſſeſſion*, not to give him *right*, for that he had before by *inheritance*.

8. That the ſame *right* cannot be held by two *tenures* appears by this; becauſe if it might, it being evidently poſſible that thoſe two *tenures* might be *ſeparated* and placed in ſeveral *ſubjects*, the *inheritance* in one, the *conqueſt* in another, it muſt follow from thence, that each of thoſe perſons ſhall have the *right*; which as it is unimaginable, ſpeaking of the whole *right* or *propriety in integrum* to the whole *power*, for if one have it *all*, the other can have no part of it, ſo if it be applied to a *partial right* (which more than one may have, either *ſeverally*, or *ſocially*, and *jointly*, to the ſame thing) then that is the changing of the *Queſtion* which ſpake of the *whole right*, and not onely of ſome one or more *parts* or *branches* of it.

9. And therefore as this *Gentleman* agrees with me in the *concluſion*, that *Rome* hath no title to our *obedience*, from that of *converting* us, or if it had, it could not plead the ſame from *S.* Peter's *univerſal Paſtorſhip*, ſo I cannot diſcern, why my way of *inferring* it was diſliked, or my *ignorance* in the *Lawes* cenſured, for ſaying that the *title* of *deſcent* is excluſive to that of *conqueſt*, meaning it not of *ſeveral* parts, of which one comes by *deſcent*, the other by *conqueſt*, but of the ſame whole thing, of which he that hath the right by *deſcent*, may by the *ſword* and *conqueſt* vindicate his *right*, and *acquire*

quiet

quiet poſſeſſion, but cannot be ſaid to *acquire* his *right* by thoſe means, being ſuppoſed to have had it, before he made uſe of them.

Sect. II.

The Britiſh Church not converted from Rome.

Num. 1. HAving granted me my *concluſion*, that our *obedience* to *Rome* is not due from the *Nation's converſion* by *miſſion* from thence, he is yet reſolved to examine my *arguments*, by which I prove what he *grants*. And there be *three* things, that here he takes notice of. The firſt in theſe words,

2. *But to come to ſome matter, His firſt argument is that this Iſland was converted before S.* Auguſtine's *time, ſurely he means by the name of Iſland, the Land and Mountains and trees, for if he ſpeak of the men, what hath the converſion of the former Iſlanders to doe with the ſubjection and duty which the Saxons owe.*

3. I anſwer, by this *Iſland*, I mean not the *mountains*, nor *trees*, on one ſide, any more than the *preſent individual perſons* on the other ſide, but the *inhabitants* of it *indefinitely*, who have *ſucceeded* one another, whether *Britiſh* or *Saxon* by extraction. For, *firſt*, of the *Britiſh* it is certain that they were not converted by *miſſion* from *Rome*, but were *Chriſtians* long before S. *Auguſtine's* coming hither, And *Secondly*, of the *Saxons* it may be remembred, that *Auguſtine* did not *abſolutely* introduce *Chriſtianity* among them here, but *Luidhardus*, that came out of *France* with *Bertha*, *Ethelred's* Wife, and was a *Biſhop* here, had prepared the way for *Auguſtine*. See *Bede Hiſt: Eccl:* lib. 1. c. 25, 26. And *Thirdly*, if *Auguſtine* were the firſt *converter* of the *Saxons*, and ſo that be, without farther *queſtion*, granted of him, yet that cannot belong to the whole *Iſland*, the *Dominion* of *Wales* being neither of *Saxon* extraction, nor converted from *Rome* to *Chriſtianity*. And this is the deſigne of that argument of mine, In caſe there were a duty owing to that *See*, from whence the converter came, and in caſe that were acknowledged

knowledged to pertain to the *Saxons*, yet ſtill the *Britiſh* part would not be concluded by either of theſe, it being certain that their *Anceſtors* were not comprehended in this number.

4. But becauſe this *Gentleman* waves this title from *converſion*, neither ſhall I farther inſiſt to diſprove it; But rather ask, why no *anſwer* was made to thoſe *teſtimonies*, which in that place were occaſionally vouched to ſhew that at the *time* of *Auguſtine's coming* into this *Iſland*, the *Chriſtian Church* here acknowledged no ſubjection to *Rome*, or to any other *Church*, to be due from them, which certainly is ſome *prejudice* to the claim drawn from the *Univerſal Paſtorſhip* of S. *Peter* and his *ſucceſſor* at *Rome*.

5. To that which is there ſaid for the evidencing this out of the *Annals* of *Giſburne*, It will not be amiſſe here to adde what our *ſtories* tell us, that when the *Pelagian hereſie*, which firſt ſprang from *Morgan* a *Britain*, was by *Agricola* brought into this *Iſland*, the *Britains* * *unwilling to receive their infuſions*, and yet *unable to reſiſt them* without aſſiſtance from ſome other *Church*, in this time of need, applied not themſelves to *Rome*, as in their * *ſecular* diſtreſſes they had accuſtomed, but to their neighbours of *France*, who calling a *Councel* ſent *Germanus Altiſiodorenſis* and *Lupus* to their aid, by which means the *Catholick Faith* was much revived and increaſed and *propagated* among them.

* *Neq; ſuſcipere dogma perverſũ vellens, neque verſutiam nefaria perſuaſionis refutare verbis certando ſufficeret: Bed. l. 1. c. 17.*

* *Bed. l. 1. c. 12, 13.*

Sect. III.

S. Paul's *plantations an argument againſt the Univerſal Paſtorſhip of S.* Peter. *S.* Paul's *being Biſhop of* Rome, *no anſwer to it.*

Num. 1. THE *argument* which he next ſpeaks to, is that wherein from *Paul's* having planted ſome *Churches*, which yet are not ſubjected to the *Chair*, where S. *Paul* ſate (whether *Antioch* or *Rome*) I conclude againſt this *claim* of power from the *title* of converſion: To this he thus ſpeaks,

2. *His next Argument demandeth, whether all that S.* Paul *converted, were obliged to be under him; truly if it were to pur-* Sect. 8.

pose, I believe there might be proof that S. Paul *expected it; but he doth not remember that he told us S.* Paul *was Bishop of* Rome, *and so it cometh to the same question, but indeed he quite misseth the matter, for no body stateth this for the Popes title, but aggravation of the schisme.*

3. 3. To what purpose it is to say there *might be proof*, and yet to *produce* none, I know not; This onely I desire to note, that if any such *proof* were produced, and, without that, by the bare pretending that it *might* be *proved*, *S.* Peter's *universal Pastorship* must be disclaimed, and consequently all right which derives its *original* from thence.

4. For *S.* Paul's *labours* being more *abundant than all* the *Apostles*, 'tis certain great numbers were *converted* by him, and if all they were to be under S. *Paul*, how can S. *Peter* be *Pastor* and *Ruler* of *all*, it being certain, that S. *Paul* was not *subordinate* to S. *Peter*.

5. And it is of little force what I am reminded of (though sure I never *forgot* it) that *S.* Paul *was Bishop of* Rome, *and so it cometh to the same question:* For 1. S. *Paul* being *Bishop* of the *Gentile* part of the *Roman Christians*, as S. *Peter* of the *Jewish*, and those then *disparate* congregations, S. *Paul* cannot be thought in his *converting* the *Gentiles* of other nations, to bring in *subjects* to S. *Peter*; And 2. it is evident that S. *Paul* was not *Bishop* of *Rome* when he placed *Timothy* over *Asia*, and *Titus* over *Crete*, and consequently the *conversion* and establishment of those *Churches* was not in any reason to acquire any *Dominion* to *Rome*, which S. *Paul* had never seen at that time, and which was it self *converted* after those, and that was it which I was proving.

6. But he bethinketh himself at last, and confesseth that this of *conversion* is not the *Pope's title* to *England*, And having done so before, why might he not have permitted me to bring undeniable *evidences* for the proof of it?

Sect. IV.

The concernments of Rome *in the Princes power to remove Patriarchates. The examples of it.* Juſtiniana, *the Canon of* Chalcedon, *and the 6t Councel.* Valentinian *making* Ravenna *a Patriarchate.* Ἀνωθεν δοθεῖσα.

Num. 1. TO put this whole matter out of *controverſie*, viz: that the *Church* of *England* is not bound to be *ſubject* to that *Church*, from which it firſt received the *Faith*, one head of *argument* I pitcht on, the *power* of *Kings* to *remove* or *erect Primacies* and *Patriarchates*, which if it have truth in it, evidently proves, that in caſe we were once under the *See* of *Rome*, as our *Patriarchate* or *Prime See* (ſuppoſing that of *Univerſal Paſtorſhip* diſproved before, and not reconcileable with this *title* to *England* by having *converted*) yet it was in the *power* of our *Kings* to *remove* that from *Rome* to *Canterbury*. For the proof of this, evidences were brought both from the *Councel* (and that *OEcumenical*) of *Chalcedon*, and from the *practice* of *Princes*, particularly *Juſtinian* in an eminent inſtance, and *Valentinian* and others before the *Councel* of *Chalcedon*, and many the like examples in the *Records* of this *Kingdome*, and of others, as is ſhewed at large, and the ground of all inſiſted on, the *ſupreme* power of *Kings* in *Eccleſiaſtical* affairs, and this is done in 16 *ſections*, from the 9th to the end of that *Chapter*. Againſt all which (that we may ſee how true the *title* of this *Gentleman's Book* is, *An Anſwer to the moſt material parts* &c.) that which is confronted, is contained in theſe words,

2. *Thirdly, He ſaith it was in the Emperors power to conſtitute Patriarchs: whether that be ſo or not, it will not be much to our purpoſe to diſpute here, onely this I ſay, that he ſeems neither to underſtand the queſtion, nor proves what he would; he underſtands not the queſtion, which hath no dependency on the nature of Patriarchs, or terms of gratitude, but on the donation of Chriſt: he proves not what he would, for he produceth onely the act of an Emperour accounted Tyrannical towards the Church, without proof and diſcuſſion whether it was well or ill done, which*

was requisite to make good his proof; neither doth he say whether the thing were done or no by the consent of Bishops, especially since the Pope was an Actor in the businesse, he addeth an Apocryphal decree of Valentinian *the third, for giving of priviledges purely Ecclesiastical to the Bishop of* Ravenna, *which out of his liberality he makes a Patriarch, but on the whole matter this is to be observed, that generally the Bishops consents were prædemanded or præordered, as in the Council of* Chalcedon, Can. 17. *it is ordered that the Church should translate their Bishoprick according to the Emperours changing of his City, and when the Emperours did it, it is said they did it according to the power given them, to wit, by the Church, so that a few examples to the contrary, produced in the reigns of headstrong and Tyrannical Princes, as the most of those are noted to be, under whom they are urged, prove nothing, and if they did, yet cannot they be taken as testimonies, when these matters of fact are onely so attributed to Princes, as no way to exclude the Church, but whatsoever it was, it doth not at all appertaine to the question, since the Popes authority, in the sense he calls him Pope, is not properly Patriarchal, nor hath any dependency upon, or from change of places made by the command of Princes.*

3. The first thing here answered is, that it is not much to the *Romanists* purpose to *dispute*, whether or no the *Emperour* hath power to *constitute Patriarchs*. (He ought to have added, or to *translate* them from one *City* to *another*, for that is in that *Tract* also expresly proved, but this I suppose not without *reason* omitted, because the power to *erect* or *constitute*, supposes and implies the power to *translate* them.) And if this be not this *Gentleman's* intereſt to *dispute*, I shall then by his good leave, *suppose* it yeilded me, and observe what the *consequences* will be.

4. And 1. In case the *power* of the *Pope* be a *Patriarchal* power, and no more, and that appear to be all that the *antient Councils* ever allowed it to be, then it immediately followes, that it is in the power of the *Emperour* to *translate* and *remove* it from that to any other *See*, and in that case what befell *Constantinople* by way of *advancement*, from the

title

title of an *ordinary Suffragan Biſhops* See, it aſcended to *equal* dignity and *privileges* with *Rome* it ſelf, will in the *reverſe* be the condition of *Rome*; from the firſt *Patriarchal* See in the *whole* world, nothing hinders but that it may become the *See* of the moſt *ordinary Biſhop* And ſure 'twill be the *Romaniſts* concernment to diſpute that principle, from which this may poſſibly be the *undeniable concluſion.*

5. But if, as here it ſeems to be interpoſed, the *power* of *Rome* be that of *Univerſal Paſtorſhip*, no way dependant on the nature of *Patriarchs*, or on any other tenure, but the *donation* of *Chriſt* to Saint *Peter*, then 1. it muſt be remembred that after the refuting of any ſuch *right* from *Chriſts donation* in the former *Chapters*, the *removal* alſo of this was in all reaſon to prove of ſome *intereſt* to the *Romaniſt*, and ſo it muſt, till the proofes of thoſe *Chapters* be perfectly anſwered, which yet hath not been done in any *degree*, as this reply to the few anſwers applyed to thoſe *Chapters* hath *ſhewed.*

6. Secondly, This adhering thus wholly to this *donation* of *Chriſt*, and the *Univerſall Paſtorſhip* deduced from thence, is the direct diſclaiming of all the *Canonical Privileges* belonging to *Rome*, on the ſcore of *Patriarchy*, and ſo in caſe that firſt *tenure* ſhall faile, it is the *degrading* of *Rome* from that *dignity*, which by *antient Canon* belong'd to it, that of the *Prime Patriarchy*, and ſo cuts the *Romaniſt* off from all the advantage he can reape either from the affirmation of *Fathers* or *Councels*, any farther than they are founded in, and referre to *Chriſts donation* of *Univerſal Paſtorſhip* to Saint *Peter*, which whether it will prove to be the *intereſt* of this *Gentleman*, I muſt leave him to judge for himſelfe, and onely adde in the laſt place, that againſt him that aſſerts the *Biſhop* of *Romes Univerſal Paſtorſhip* upon what title ſoever, this will neceſſarily be a ſhrewd *prejudice*, if it be not diſputed but yeilded, that it is in the *power* of *Princes* to *erect* or *tranſlate Patriarchies*, by *Patriarchies* underſtanding (as it is evident I doe in that diſcourſe) chiefe *Independent* authorities over other *Churches*, ſuch as was by *Juſtinian* conferred on *Juſtiniana Prima* and *Carthage*, by *Valentinian*

on *Ravenna*, without any *ſubordination* to, or *dependence* on any other, particularly on the *See* of *Rome*.

7. Can any thing be more *prejudicial* to the *Univerſall Paſtorſhip* of *Rome* than this? Can *Rome* be *Paſtor* of thoſe who have no *dependance* on her? or can that be *Univerſal*, from which ſome particulars are *exempt*?

8. This made it but *neceſſary* for this *Gentleman* to undertake *two* things in the following words, that I *neither underſtand the queſtion, nor prove what I would*; for if I ſhall yet appear to *judge* aright of the *queſtion*, even as it is by this *Gentleman* brought back to that which had been debated in the *former Chapters*, whether the *Biſhop* of *Rome* be *Univerſal Paſtor* by *Chriſts donation* to Saint *Peter*, and if I have really proved that it is in the *power* of *Emperours* and *Princes* to *conſtitute* and *remove Patriarchies*, It will certainly follow, that I have done all that I *undertook* to doe, evinced the matter of the *queſtion*, and ſhewd that it is in the *power* of *Princes* to exempt ſome *Churches* from the *Popes* dominion, and ſo ſuperſeded the *Univerſality* of his *Paſtorſhip*.

9. As for the *validity* of my *proofes*, that muſt be judged by the *view* of the *Anſwers* applyed to them, 1. that I *produce onely the act of an Emperour accounted Tyrannicall towards the Church*. To this I anſwer, 1. that the word [*onely*] excluding all others, the *propoſition* can have no truth in it, it being evident that I produce many other *acts* of the ſame *Imperial power*, as the *Reader* may finde by caſting his eye on the place, the latter part of that *6. Chap*: and this *Gentleman* himſelfe ſhall be my witneſſe, (who ſaith of me [*he addeth an Apocryphal decree of* Valentinian] which though it be not a *recitation* of all that are by me added, yet is ſufficient to *teſtifie* the *contrary*, to what the [*onely*] had affirmed.

10. Secondly, The *character* that is given that *Emperour*, whoſe act I firſt produced, that he is *accounted Tyrannicall towards the Church*, will, I ſuppoſe, ſignifie but this, that he that did any thing *derogatory* to the *Univerſal Paſtorſhip* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, is by this prejudged from yeilding us any *competent* teſtimony in this diſpute, which is in effect that this *Gentleman* is in the *right*, and all that is, or ſhall, or can be brought

brought *againſt* him muſt ſignifie *nothing*, which ſure is not the way of *anſwering* arguments, but adhering to *concluſions*, without weighing what is or can be brought againſt them.

11. Thirdly, For that *particular* act, and the *Emperor* which is thus *cenſured*: It is *Juſtinian*, that *great* and *famous Emperour*, his making the *Biſhop* of *Juſtiniana Prima* the head of all *Dacia*, &c. of which this *Gentleman* had paſt a very different *judgement*, when it came under his *view* in the *former* Chapter.

12. There his *anſwer* was, the *Emperour exempted* it not from the *Popes ſubjection*, pag 15. and yet now when the very ſame *paſſage* comes in his way againe, he hath forgotten himſelfe, and the *Emperour*, that juſt now had as great *care* of the *Popes ſpiritual power*, as of his *owne civill*, is in a moment become *Tyrannicall towards the Church*. I deſire one of theſe *anſwers*, being thus engaged, may make good the *conteſt* againſt the other.

13. But then 4. whatſoever can be ſaid of that *Emperor* in other reſpects, 'tis certaine that this erecting of *Juſtiniana* was no act of *tyranny* againſt the *Church*, but the very thing that is *authoriſed* by the 17 *Canon* of the *General Council* of *Chalcedon* (which is one of thoſe that the *Pope* at his *conſecration* ſolemnly vows to obſerve, and all the *Ordinances* made in them) for that reſolves that if any *City* be built or reſtored by the *Kings power*, the *Eccleſiaſtical* order muſt follow the *Political*, τύποι *i. e.* the βασιλικὰ πρόσταγματα, ſaith the *Scholiaſt*, the *Imperial decrees* concerning that *City* *ἔχειν ὀθισκοπῆς ἀξίωμα ἢ μητροπόλεως, *to have the dignity of an Epiſcopal or Metropolitical See*. And the ſame againe in the ſame words was decreed by the 6. *Council in Trullo*, *Can.* 38. from whence certainly *Balſamon*'s concluſion is irrefragable, *ὅτι ἔξεστι τῷ βασιλεῖ πρόνομια ἐκκλησιαστικὰ ἀφαιρεῖσθαι, *that it is lawfull* (and ſo ſure not *Tyrannical*) *for a Prince to take away* (or *remove*) *the privileges of the Church* of any *City*, and *ὑπολυπῶν τὰ βουλητέα αὐτῷ χάριν τῶν ὀθισκοπικῶν δικαίων, *to determine, as he ſhall pleaſe, concerning the Privileges of Biſhops*.

* *Balſam. in Concil. in Trull: Can.* 38.

* *I Concil. Chal.* c. 17.

* *Ib. pag.* 342.

His

14. His ſecond *anſwer* is, that I doe *not ſay whether the thing were done or no by the conſent of Biſhops, eſpecially ſince the Pope was an Actor in the buſineſſe.* To which I anſwer, that when I have made it appear to be the *act* of the *Emperour*, and that by the *Canons* of *Councels* it was acknowledged fully *lawfull* for the *Emperour*, and ſo for other *Princes*, to doe ſo, I need neither inquire whether the *conſent* of *Biſhops*, or of the *Pope* himſelf were added to it, ſuch *formalities* of *conſent* may be had or omitted without any *diſturbance* to, or *influence* on the matter.

15. His third *anſwer* is applied to that *Act* of *Valentinian*, which made *Ravenna* a *Patriarchate*, and firſt he calls the *Decree* of that *Emperour* an *Apocryphall decree*; 2. He ſaith that it was *giving to the Biſhop privileges purely Eccleſiaſtical*, reproving me for making him a *Patriarch*; For the *firſt*, I anſwer, that as I never thought it any piece of the *Canon* of *Scripture*, by which *Valentinian* did this or any more than a *Reſcript* of an *Emperour*, which, if ſuch, is certainly ſufficient to expreſſe it an *Imperial Act*, ſo the *authorities* for this may reſcue it from farther *queſtion*, for though it were not *Baronius*'s intereſt to *believe* it, and ſo it is by him *ſuſpected* of *forgery*, *An.*432. *n.*93. yet even *he* acknowledgeth it to be *very antient*, and owned by *ſeveral Writers*, n.92. and afterwards, when the ſame *authorities* which are produced for this, *Hier: Rubeus*, and the *Records* of *Ravenna*, ſeem to favour his *grand* deſign, i. e. make for *Rome*, he can then very fairly make uſe of them, though it be but a *narration* of a *viſion*, *An.*433. n. 24. But I need not lay more *weight* on this, than the *Apocryphal* (as he calls it) *Decree* will be able to ſupport, this is no *ſingular* preſident, many *examples* there are of the like which are there mentioned in the *Tract* of *Schiſme*.

16. For the ſecond, *Patriarchal* power *Ravenna* had without any *dependance* on the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, and I pretend no more for the *Biſhop* of *Canterbury*, and therein alſo ſhall bate him the title of *Patriarch*, What he adds (by way of obſervation on the whole matter) 1. that *generally the Biſhops conſents were prædemanded or prærordered, as in the Councel of* Chalcedon, *Can.*17. *Secondly*, that what the *Emperours did*, they

did by the *power given them by the Church*, will ſoon appear to bring him little *advantage*, For

17. 1. The *Biſhop*'s (I ſuppoſe he means the *Biſhop* of *Rome* his) *conſent* was not *asked*; One part of the *ſtory* is, that when the *Biſhop* of *Ravenna*, being fain to flie to the *Biſhop* of *Rome* for ſupport againſt the *Longobards*, ſubmitted himſelf to him, the people of *Ravenna* thought themſelves *injured* thereby; And 2. it is not truly ſaid, that it was *præordered*, and the *Canon* of the *Councel* of *Chalcedon* cannot be brought to that purpoſe, this *act* of *Valentinians* dated *Anno* 432. being 19 years before the *Councel* of *Chalcedon*, which was aſſembled *Anno* 451. and ſo ſure not *præordained* by that which was ſubſequent; And indeed the *Canon* of that *Councel* mentioning *Cities* and *Churches* in the *plural*, which had been * before their *Seſſion* made *Metropoles* by *ſeveral Kings*, is a clear evidence that there were other ſuch, beſide that of *Ravenna*, and **Balſamon* expreſſeth them by the name of *Madyta*, and *Abydus* &c.

* ὅσαι ἢ ἤδη πόλεις διὰ γεαμμάτων βασιλικῶν πρὸ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐτιμήθησαν ὀνόματι, *Can.* 12.

* διαφόροι βασιλεῖς ὀπισκοπὰς εἰς μητροπόλεις ἐτίμησαν, *Balſam: in Can:* 12.

18. *Thirdly*, If this be acknowledged an *act* of *Councel* confirming the *lawfulneſs* of what the *Emperours* had thus done, and decreeing (as clearly the *Councel* of *Chalcedon* and that other *in Trullo* did) that generally it ſhould be thus, that as the *Prince* made an *ordinary* City a *Metropolis*, the *Church* of that City ſhould be a *Metropolitical Church*, then ſtill this is the fuller evidence, that it was *lawfull* for *Princes* thus to doe, and that as oft as they did, ſuch changes in the *Churches* followed, for ſure a *King* was not obliged to ask the *Churches* leave to repair or *build* a *city*.

19. *Laſtly*, What out of *Balſamon* was cited by me, that what the *Emperors* did in this matter they *did according to the power that was given them*] was, it ſeems, either an *occaſion* of *ſtumbling* to this *Gentleman*, or an *excuſe* of it; For from hence he concludes that this *power* was *given* them by the *Church*; This, if it be true, is the thing that I would *demand*, and ſo farre, from anſwering mine *inſtance:* for if the *Church* have given *Princes* this *power*, then they may *freely* and *lawfully* make uſe of it; and *Juſtinian*'s doing ſo could be no *tyrannical act* againſt the *Church*. But let us view **Balſamon*'s words,

* *in Chalced: Can.* 12.

words, They are these, τοὺς τοιούτους γίνεσθαι ὁρισμοὺς παρὰ τῶν βασιλέων κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτοῖς ἄνωθεν ἐξουσίαν, *such definitions are made by Kings according to the power given them from above.* That word ἄνωθεν *from above*, sometimes signifies in respect of *time*, sometimes also in respect of *place*; In the *first* respect it signifies *from of old*, and is oft joyned with ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, *from the beginning*; and if it be so taken here, as *Gentianus Hervetus* interprets it *olim*, it must then signifie that this *power* was yeilded to *Kings* either by the *Apostles*, or by the *Primitive Canons* of the *Church*, and if it were thus *given* them by the *Church*, then sure they might justly *challenge* and *exercise* it freely. But in the second sense, it is as certain that ἄνωθεν signifies *from above*, i. e. *from heaven*, so *Joh.* 19. 11. *Christ* tells *Pilate*, *thou couldst have no power over me*, εἰ μὴ ἦν σοι δεδομένον ἄνωθεν, *unlesse it were given thee from above*, i.e. sure *from heaven*, from *God*, by whom *Kings reign* and have their *power*, and so it very frequently signifies in the * *Scripture*; And if that be the the meaning, then this *Gentleman* sees how well he hath *inferred* his *conclusion* from this passage.

* *Jam.* 1. 17. 3. 15, 17. &c.

20. By all this it already appears what truth there is in this suggestion, that the *examples produced* are but *few*, and those of *tyrannical Princes*, and *no way excluding the Church*] just as much, and no more, as was in the *premisses*, which induced it, and those being *discovered* already, it is *superfluous* to make repetitions so soon in this place.

21. In the close he thinks fit to retire again to his old *fortresse*, that the *Popes power* is not *Patriarchal*, and so that he is still safe from all that hath been said on that head; But it hath now appeared, that if any other be made a *Patriarch* or *Primate*, or (whatever the style be) a *Bishop* without any *dependence* on the *Pope*, this is a *prejudice* sufficient to his *Universal Pastorship*, and other *disadvantages* he is rather in reason to expect by disclaiming the *Patriarchal authority*, which the *Canons* have allowed him, than hope to *gain* any thing by contemning his *inheritance*.

CHAP.

Chap. VII.

An Anſwer to the Exceptions made to the ſeventh Chapter.

Sect. I.

King Henry's *deſire of Reconciliation to* Rome. *The ſacriledge, &c. no argument againſt Regal power to remove Patriarchies. Poſſeſſion in the belief of the Popes ſupremacy. Preſcribing for errour.* Napier's *teſtimony. Poſſeſſion, if granted from* Auguſtine's *coming into* England, *no argument of truth. Confeſſions of Popes.* Auguſtine *required it not. Pope* Gregory's *teſtimony. Many evidences that this belief was not received after* Auguſtine's *time.*

Num. 1. WHat in the next place is replied to that part of *Chapter* 7. which concerned *Henry* VIII. his *act* of *ejecting* the *Power* of the *Pope*, will be full matter for a *firſt ſection* of this *Chapter*. He begins thus,

2. *In his ſeventh Chapter he intends a juſtification of the breach whereof as he doth not teach the infamous occaſion, and how to his dying day the ſame King deſired to be reconciled, as alſo that it was but the coming two daies ſhort of a Poſt to* Rome, *which hindered that the reconcilement was not actually made, as may be ſeen in my Lord of* Cherbery's *Book* fol. 368. *and that the moderate Proteſtants curſe the day wherein it was made, ſo the very naming of* Hen. *VIII. is enough to confute all his diſcourſe,* Sir *Walter one of the darlings of his daughter having given him ſuch a character, as hath ſtamped him for* England's Nero *to future poſterity, and as it was ſaid of* Nero *in reſpect of Chriſtian religion, ſo might it be of him reſpecting the unity of the Church,* viz: *it muſt be a great good that he began to perſecute and aboliſh: and as for the* Acts *paſſed in the Univerſities, Convocation,*

Begun in *Hen.* 8.

Raleigh in Preface to Hiſtor: of the World.

tion or Parliament, let the blood ſhed by that Tyrant bear witneſſe what voluntary and free Acts they were. eſpecially thoſe two upon his Seneca *and* Burrhus, *Biſhop* Fiſher, *and the Chancellor* More, *that he might want nothing of being throughly paral'eld to* Nero.

But methinks the Doctor differs not much in this, ſeeming tacitly to grant the Biſhops were forced, awed by that noted ſword in a ſlender thread, the præmunire which did hang over their heads, though in the concluſion of that Sect: he ſaies we ought to judge charitably, viz: *that they did not judge for fear nor temporal Intereſts, yet after waves the advantage of that charitable judgment, and ſaith, That if what was determined were falſly determined by the King and Biſhops, then the voluntary and free doing it will not juſtifie, and if it were not, then was there truth in it, antecedent to, and abſtracted from the determination, and it was their duty ſo to determine, and crime that they were unwilling: laying the whole weight of the argument upon this, that the pretenſions for the Popes ſupremacy in* England *muſt be founded either as ſucceſſor to S.* Peter *in the univerſal Paſtorſhip of the Church, ſo including* England *as a member thereof; or upon paternal right reſpecting S.* Auguſtine's *converſion, or upon conceſſion from ſome of our Kings &c. To which I anſwer, that we relie on the firſt as the foundation and corner-ſtone of the whole building, On the ſecond as an action worthy the ſucceſſor of S.* Peter, *which requires a gratefull conſideration from us; And on the third not as a conceſſion, but as a juſt acknowlengment of what was neceſſary for the good of Chriſtian Religion, taught our Kings by thoſe who taught them Chriſtian Religion; of which belief, I mean that the Pope as Succeſſor to S.* Peter *is head and governour of the Univerſal Church, we have been in poſſeſſion ever ſince the converſion of our Engliſh Anceſtors, then Saxons, to the Chriſtian religion, made by* Auſtin *the Monk ſent hither by Pope* Gregory *for that purpoſe; untill that good King* Henry *the VIII. out of ſcrupuloſity of conſcience (no noubt) was pleaſed to cut the Gordian knot of thoſe bonds, within which all his Anceſtors limited themſelves; neither ſhall all that the Doctor and his fellows have ſaid, or can ſay, juſtifie themſelves ſo, but that ſuch a poſſeſſion, as I here*

ſpeak

ſpeak of, will convince them of ſchiſme, though all thoſe replies, which by ours have been 40 *times made to every one of thoſe arguments the Doctor uſes, ſhould bear but equal weight in the ſcale, which we think hoiſes it up into the aire, for the arguments muſt be demonſtrative and clear to men of common ſenſe, that muſt overthrow ſuch a poſſeſſion; and therefore it is that the Puritans, who are much leſſe friends to the Church of* Rome *than to the Church of* England, *wave all diſputing out of Antiquity, and confeſſe that the Church of* Rome *hath born a ſway without any debatable contradiction over the Chriſtian world* 126 *years, a time that no King in the world can pretend to by ſucceſſion from his Anceſtors for poſſeſſion of his crown, and yet I believe the Doctor would conclude thoſe ſubjects guilty of rebellion, which ſhould goe about to deprive ſuch a King of his Crown, though he could not ſhew writings evidently concluding for him* 12, 14, 15, *or* 1600 *years agoe, how much more if he could ſhew them demonſtrating his right, in the interpretation of as wiſe and learned men as the world hath, and* 20 *times the numbers of their adverſaries.*

Napier on the Revelation.

3. The firſt thing here objected to my *diſcourſe*, is, as *Orators* are wont to doe for the raiſing of *paſſions*, a mention of ſome *circumſtances*, which though *extrinſecal* to the matter, may yet hope to have ſome *influence* on an *unwary* Reader, and infuſe no ſmall *prejudices* into him; ſuch are the *infamous* occaſion of the *breach* begun by that *King*, and ſuch is the odious *character* faſtned on him of *England's Nero* &c.

4. But it cannot be neceſſary for me to offer an *Apologie* on either of theſe two heads, If that which he did in this particular of *ejecting* the *Papal* power, be in it ſelf *juſtifiable*, both in reſpect of the matter of the *action*, and the competency of the *power* that did it, it matters not what moved him to doe it, or how inclinable he was to have *reſcinded* it. The farther he were from a truly *pious* man, the more likely it is, he might be brought by *ſecular intereſts* (and the leſſe likely that it was by any *religious*) to *undoe* all that upon the *weightieſt* grounds of *reaſon*, had been eſtabliſht by him. Without examining therefore the truth of that *ſuggeſtion*, that to *his dying day he deſired to be reconciled*, and without demanding

what is meant by that phraſe, *deſired to be reconciled*, whether any *overture* to receive the *Popes* on his *owne* termes, into full *poſſeſſion* againe, or onely a *deſire* to *approve* himſelfe to the *Pope*, that he ſtill maintained the *Catholike*, nay *Roman Faith* (as we know he put men to *death* for denying ſome *Doctrines* profeſt at *Rome*) that what he had done was no whit *injurious* to *him*, prejudiciall, or derogatory to any *right*, which could juſtly be chalenged by the *Pope* in this *Kingdome*; without either of theſe inquires, I ſay, If I ſhall take for granted the *utmoſt* that can be pretended, that for a *long* time together he *deſired* to have *reſcinded* what he had done, I ſee not what *diſadvantage* this can be to our *pretenſions*.

5. For 1. I ſhall demand, was he all this while, that he thus deſired to be *reconciled*, a truly *changed* and *Pious Prince*, was that *principle* of wicked *life* ſo ſoone *eradicated*, which even now denominated him a *Nero*, and made it fit to eſteeme that a *great good*, *which he began to aboliſh*, and did he thus continue a *new*, *reformed penitent* to his *dying* day? If ſo, then truly Sir *W. R.* was very *unkinde* and *unchriſtian* in recording his *crimes*, and omitting his *repentance*; and it is no *excellent* port of this *Gentlemans character*, that he thought fit to *imitate* and *quote* him in this; the ſame *injuſtice* in an *Hiſtorian* or *Obſervator*, that it had been in *Euſebius* to take ſo much of the *life* of *Conſtantine* out of *Zoſimus* or *Julian's Cæſars*, as ſhould render him juſtly *odious*, and to omit the whole *latter* part of his *life*, which was ſo eminently *vertuous* and *Chriſtian*.

6. But if this *Prince* ſtill continued to be like that *image*, which here is *pourtrayed* of him, then ſure I ſhall with the ſame *evidence* of *proofe* be allowed to object thoſe *vices*, and thoſe no excellent *Chriſtian* motives that incited it, to his *deſire* of being *reconciled* or his willingneſſe to *re-admit* the *Papall* power into this *Kingdome*, and conclude, that the *ejection* of it muſt be a *great good*, which he was ſo *inclinable* to *aboliſh*, and ſo the *faith* of the *reformed*, which he ſo more than *began* to *perſecute*, and all this as *regularly* as his *perſonall vices*, and the *infamus occaſion*, be it never ſo truly ſo,

can

can be *objected* to that *act* of State, which paſt in that *Kings* reigne, for the *diſclaimig* the *Papal* powers among us.

7. Nay, if that *paſſage* in his ſtorie had acquired a yet farther degree of *Truth*, if the *Poſt* had come *two dayes ſooner* to *Rome*, and ſo had actually compoſed the *difference* between that *King* and that *Pope*, ſo as had been moſt for the *intereſt* of *Rome*, yet it is evident, that my diſcourſe had no way been concerned in this; This evidently had been no more, than what afterwards came to paſſe in *Queen Marie's* dayes, and it would ſtill be in the *power* of *King* Henries *immediate ſucceſſor*, to remove the *power* from *Rome* to *Canterbury*, as it had been in the *power* of *Henry* either to doe it, or *undoe* it againe.

8. And therefore the whole matter ſtill divolves (as it did in the *tract* of *Schiſme*) to that *one queſtion*, whether the *Biſhop* of *Rome* had at that time any *real authority* here, which the *King* might not lawfully *remove* from him to the *Arch-Biſhop* of *Canterbury*, and muſt be decided as there it is, by the view of *Evidences*, whether that pretended from *Peters Univerſal Paſtorſhip*, or that from *Auguſtines planting Chriſtianity* here, or that from the *voluntary conceſſion* of ſome *Kings*, and each of them is ſo diſproved there, that till ſome competent *anſwer* be rendered to thoſe particulars, (which certainly is not yet done by this *Gentleman*, who onely here tells us the manner how he *relyes* on each of theſe, and the *poſſeſſion* they had of the *beliefe* that the *Pope* was head of the *Univerſal Church*) 'tis perfectly unneceſſary farther to conſider what is here added, onely to *inflame paſſions*, but not to *ſatisfie Conſcience*, to *exaſperate*, not to *argue*.

9. For what if *moderate Proteſtants* ſhould truly *curſe the day*, &c. or, in a more *Chriſtian dialect*, expreſſe their *diſlike* to the great *Sacrilege*, and ſome other *enormities*, which were committed in that *Princes reigne*, what prejudice will this be to any *lawful exerciſe* of that *regal power*? 'Tis certaine that all the *Acts* of a *bad Prince* are not *invalid* or *null*, and much more evident ſtill, that he that hath not *offended* in *aſſuming* the *power* which *really* belongs to him, may by being *denyed* that,

that, be *inraged*, and laid open, to importune *Temptations*, and if he be not a through *Chriſtian*, *conſtant* and *maſterly*, fall, and that foulely under thoſe *temptations*. And if *Henry* VIII. did ſo, ſtill this is very *extrinſecall* to the *preſent* inquiry, whether he as *King* had power to *remove* a *Patriarchy*, and by that to *remove* all forraigne *jurisdiction* or *authority* out of this *Church*.

10. All that remaines in this *Section*, farther to be ſpoken to, is the *poſſeſſion* that is here *pleaded*, not in the *power* it ſelfe, (if it were, that hath *formerly* been ſpoken to) but in the *beliefe*, that the *Pope* as *ſucceſſor* to S. *Peter*, is *head* and *Governour* of the *Univerſal Church*. This *beliefe*, ſaith he, they have been in *poſſeſſion* of, ever ſince the *Converſion* of our *Engliſh Anceſtors*, till *King Henry*; and for this, beſide his own *bare* affirmation, he brings no other *proofe*, than one *teſtimony* of *Navier* on the *Revelation*, *confeſſing* that the *Church* of *Rome hath borne a ſway over the Chriſtian world above* 1200. *yeares*.

11. And 1. for this kinde of *Poſſeſſion*, *poſſeſſion* in the *beliefe* of any thing, any farther than that which is beleved is *true*, and that appeare ſome other way, than by our having ſo *long believed* it, certainly this is no matter of any deep *conſideration* to us; If it ſtill appeare to be *true* upon grounds of *reaſon*, thoſe grounds are the *conſiderable*, and not the *beliefe*; And if the *grounds* be diſcovered to be *fallacious*, and the *contrary* to be more *reaſonable* to be *believed*, then ſure this hath but the advantage of an *Antient error*, and the *older* it is, the fitter not to be longer continued in, it muſt be immediately *depoſited*. And againſt this, or inſtead of doing thus, to talke of *poſſeſſion* is *unnatural*, and *irrational*, the ſame plea that may ſerve for any *ſinne* that hath had the *luck* to get the firſt *hold* in us, the ſame that would certainly have held for all the Idolatry of the *Heathens*, when *Chriſt* came into the world; And he that hath long lived in *obſcurity* and *miſery* (he, and his *Anceſtors*) for many years together, and were now offered an *advancement* out of that *ſad* condition, would he ever be ſo *unkinde* to himſelfe as to refuſe that *offer*, upon this one *account*, becauſe it is the *turning* him out of a *poſſeſſion*? This

pre-

preſcribing for *Error*, and *preſcribing* for *Sin*, and *preſcribing* for *Miſery*, are in effect the ſame, equally *unnatural* and *irrational*, ſuppoſing it to be truly *Error* and *Sinne*, and *Miſery* which we treat of.

13. But then ſecondly waving this, and applying our ſelves to the *particular* before us, how doth it appeare that the *Romaniſt* hath been in *poſſeſſion* in this *beliefe*, ſo long as he pretends? He here brings but one *Teſtimony* to confirme it, that of *Napier*; But for this *teſtimony* the anſwer is eaſie, that the *affirmations* or *confeſſions* of ſuch as *Napier* was (and is by this *Gentleman* acknowledged to be) in their arguing againſt the *credit* of *Antiquity*, or to make good other *hypotheſes* of theirs, are of as little *authority* with us, as I ſuppoſe they will be with them, when they are *contrary* to their *pretenſions* or *intereſts*; Secondly, that the *Popes bearing a ſway over the Chriſtian world* is not interpretable to ſignifie his *Univerſal Paſtorſhip*; The *Biſhop* of the *Prime imperial See*, may juſtly be very *conſiderable*, and ſo *beare* a *ſway*, but it follows not thence that his *ordinary jurisdiction* hath been thus extended to the *whole Chriſtian world*.

14. Nay thirdly, the *contrary* to this hath been ſufficiently evidenced *Chap:* 4. and 5. both as concernes Saint *Peter* himſelfe, and the *Biſhop* of *Rome* as *ſucceſſor* to Saint *Peter*, and till thoſe evidences are refuted, the *affirmation* of *Napier* being ſo imperfect and *infirme*, both in reſpect of the *teſtifier* and the *matter* of the *teſtimony*, will be very unfit to *bear ſway* with any *rational* man.

15. And ſo the whole weight of this argument preſt with ſo much *confidence* is reſolved into the bare *authority* of the *Speaker*, this *Gentleman*, who ſaith it, that ever ſince the *converſion* of the *Engliſh Nation*, the *Romaniſts* have had *poſſeſſion* of this *beliefe*, that the *Pope*, as *ſucceſſor* to Saint *Peter* is *Governour* of the *Univerſal Church*.

16. And that I may apply ſome anſwer yet more *particularly* to this, I ſhall premiſe one thing, that if indeed this were granted, which is *ſuggeſted*, it would not be of any great force toward the inducing of this *concluſion*, that the *Pope* really was and is *Univerſal Paſtor*. For ſuppoſing the *Pope*

to have assumed that *authority*, at the time of *Augustine* the *Monke* his coming into *England* and making his *plantation*, and supposing him to have *preacht* this to *King Ethelbert*, and the rest of his *Proselites*, with the same *gravity* and *confidence*, that he used in imparting all the *Doctrines* of *Christian Faith* (in the same manner as *Xaverius* the *Apostle* of the *Indies* imparted to them *two Gospels*, the one of *Christ*, the other of Saint *Peter*) I shall not doubt but upon these grounds it would be very *consequent*, that all, that willingly *imbraced* the *preaching* of *Augustine*, and had no other *Doctrine* to compare it with, or *examine* it by, should probably receive this branch of *beliefe*, and so all others *from* and *after* them, that insisted firmely and punctually on *Augustine*'s way; and thus 'tis possible the *possession* of that *belief* might be *continued* till the dayes of *Hen.* VIII.

17. But then this is no *proofe* that what in this *particular Augustine* affirmed was true, or that the *beliefe* of it had *possession* in the whole *Church* before, Nay, the contrary will be most evident, that at that very time the *British Bishops* acknowledged not any such *power* over them in the *Pope* or any other, as is cited from the *Abbate* of *Bangor*, *cap.* 16. *Sect.* 5. and much more to the same purpose.

18. And 'tis no newes to remind him out of their owne *Canon Law*, that some of their *Popes* have disclaimed (and that not without great *aversation* and *detestation* of the *arrogance* of it) the title of *Universal Bishop* or *Pastor*, and acknowleged it is a very *ominous Symptome* in any that shall assume it, and considering the *prejudices* that lye against it, from the *first œcumenical Councils*, all the *Ordinances* whereof the *Popes* at their *creations* vow to maintaine *inviolably*, and against which to constitute or *innovate* any thing, *ne hujus quidem sedis potest authoritas*, *it is not in the power of this See*, saith *Pope Zosimus*, 25. *qu.* 1. c. *Contra*. I may justly conclude that all are *obliged* to doe the like.

19. But then *secondly*, what *truth* there is in it *in thesi*, that from S. *Augustine*'s *plantation* to this time of *Henry* VIII. the *Romanists* have been in *possession* of this *belief* of the *Popes universal Pastorship*, must be contested by evidences. And 1.

For

For *Auguſtine* himſelf it appears not by the *ſtory* in *Bede*, that he did at all *preach* this *doctrine* to the *nation*, nay, as upon *Auguſtine's* demand concerning *ceremonies*, *Pope Gregory* bindes him not to *conform* all to the *Canons* or *practice* of *Rome*, but bids him * *freely chooſe that which may moſt pleaſe God, whereſoever he findes it, ſive in Galliarum, ſive in qualibet Eccleſiâ*, whether in France, *or in any other Church, & hæc quaſi in Faſciculum collecta apud Anglorum mentes in conſuetudinem deponere*, make up a *Book* of ſuch *Canons* to be obſerved in *England* (which clearly ſhews that the *Romiſh Canons* were not to be in power in *England*) ſo when the difference betwixt him and the *Britiſh Biſhops* (of whom it hath been ſhewed that they *acknowledged* not the *Pope* to have any *power* over them) came to be compoſed, he required compliance and *obedience* from them but in *three* things, the * *obſervation* of *Eaſter* according to the order of the *Church* of *Rome* (and the *Nicene Canon*) the *Miniſtration* of *Baptiſme*, and joyning with him to *preach* to the *Engliſh*; Which is ſome prejudice to the *founding* of this *belief* in *Auguſtine's* preaching.

* *Eccl: Hiſt:* l. 1. c. 27.

* *Ib:* l. 2. c. 2.

20. Nay when *Bede* comes to ſpeak of *Gregory* then *Pope*, by way of *Encomium* at his death, the utmoſt he ſaith of him is, that *cùm primùm in toto orbe gereret Pontificatum, & converſis jamdudum Eccleſiis prælatus eſſet* &c. *being Biſhop of the Prime Church in the whole world, and ſet over thoſe Churches which had been long ſince converted*, and having now taken care to propagate that *faith* to *England*, he might juſtly be called *our Apoſtle*, and ſay as S. *Paul* did, that *if to others he were not an Apoſtle, yet he was to us.*

21. As for that of *Univerſal Paſtorſhip* certainly we may take *Gregory's* own word, that no ſuch thing was then thought to belong to him, in his *Epiſtle* to *Eulogius Biſhop* of *Alexandria*, viſible among his works, and inſerted in the * *body* of their *Canon Law*. *Nam dixi* &c. *I told you that you were not to write to me or any other in that ſtyle, and behold in the Preface of that Epiſtle directed to me who thus prohibited, you have ſet this proud appellation, calling me univerſal Pope or Father, which I deſire you will doe no more, for it is a derogating from you,*

* *B. Gre: Ep: ex regiſt:* l. 7. *Indict:* 1. c. 30. * *par:* 1. *diſt:* 99. *Ecce*

you, to bestow on another more than reason requires, I count it not my honour, wherein I know my brethren lose their honour, My honour is the honour of the universal Church, My honour is that my brethren should enjoy what fully belongs to them (so I render *fratrum meorum solidus vigor*) *then am I truly honoured when the honour, which is due to all, is denied to none. For if you call me universal Pope, you deny that to your self which you attribute all to me*; And farther tells him, with expressions of *aversation*, *Absit* and *recedant*—, that this honour had by a *Councel* been offered to his *Predecessors*, the *Councel* of *Chalcedon* (that gave it *equally* to him and the *Bishop* of *Constantinople*, which is in effect to give to neither the *power* or sense, but onely the *title* of it) but no one of them would ever use this title. This sure is evidence enough, that if at that time any such *belief* of the *Universal Pastorship* of the *Pope* entred this *Nation*, it must needs be the *belief* of a known acknowledged *falsity*, and so farre from a *bonæ fidei possessio*.

22. After this, what *possession* this *belief* had among us, may be judged by some of those many * *instances* put together by the *Bishops* in *Henry* VIII. his daies, as the *premises* whereon that *King* built his *conclusion* of ejecting that *Power* which was then *usurped* by the *Pope*.

* *l. de diff: Reg: et Eccl: Potest:*

23. First a *statute*, that for *Ecclesiastical appeals* they shall in the last resort lie from the *Archbishop* to the *King*, so as not to proceed any farther without the *Kings* assent.

24. *Secondly*, that *Turstan Archbishop* elect of *Yorke*, asking leave of the *King* to go to a *Councel* designed by *Calixtus*, had it granted with this *reserve*, that he should not receive *Episcopal benediction* from the *Pope*.

25. *Thirdly*, that the *Kings* of *England* from time to time, had and *exercised* authority of making *lawes* in *Ecclesiastical* matters; Eight such *Lawes* are there recited of *Canutus* his making, the like of *King Ethelred*, *Edgar*, *Edmund*, *Æthelstane*, *Ina King* of the *West Saxons*, and *King Alfred*.

26. *Fourthly*, that *William* the *Conquerour instituting* and *indowing* the *Abbey* of *Battell*, gave the *Abbat exemption* from all *jurisdiction* of any *Bishops*, *aut quarumlibet personarum dominatione*.

minatione, from all dominion or *rule of any perſons whatſoever, ſicut Eccleſia Chriſti Cantuarienſis, in like manner as the Church of* Canterbury; Which imports *two* things, 1. that the *Church* of *Canterbury* had no ſuch *Ruler* over him (but the *King*) and 2. that the *Abbat* of *Battell* was by *regal power* inveſted with the ſame *privileges*.

27. But I ſuppoſe all theſe, and many the like inſtances, which might be brought, *derogatory* enough to the *poſſeſſion* in this *belief* here pretended, will but adde one more to the *number* of ſuch *arguments*, of which this *Gentleman* ſaith, that they have *fourty* times had *replies* made to them; And truly this is a good eaſie *compendious* way, which as it ſecures him againſt all that can be *produced*, ſo it doth not *incourage* me to ſpend time in *collecting* and *producing* more, and therefore this ſhall ſuffice to have added now concerning this matter, being apt to *flatter* my ſelf, that theſe arguments are demonſtrative and clear enough to men of *common* ſenſe, to *diſprove*, and ſo to *overthrow* this *Poſſeſſion*.

Sect. II.

Queen Mary's *retaining the Supremacy. Power of refuſing Legates, unreconcileable with the Popes Supremacy.*

Num. 1. THE next *Paragraph* is an account of a paſſage cited by me from the *ſtory* of *Queen Mary*, Thus,

2. *Queen* Mary's *titular retaining of the Supremacy untill ſhe could diſpoſe the diſordered hearts of her ſubjects to get it peaceably revoked, is no authority for the Doctor, ſhe never pretending it to be lawfully done, but that ſhe could not doe otherwiſe, no more is her refuſing of a Legate, which in all Catholick times and countries hath been practiced and thought lawfull.*

3. What *civil* or *ſecular motives* they were, which kept that *Queen* ſo long from rejecting the title of *ſupreme* in her own *Kingdome*, I ſhall not need to inquire; If it were no unpardonable ſin in her to continue the *title*, and exerciſe of that *power*, which was incompetible with the *Pope's univerſal Paſtorſhip*, then why ſhould it be ſo hainous in her *Father* to

assume it? Her never pretending that it was *lawfully* done, signifies very little, as long as she pretends not the *contrary*, that it was *unlawfull*; The truth may well lie in the *middle*, that she thought it *lawful* to retain it, yet *lawful* also to bestow it on the *Bishop* of *Rome*, and upon the strength of the former *perswasion*, my *charity* obligeth me to think, that she did the *former*, and in force of the *latter* it is possible also, that she did the *latter*, though *possible* too, that she did it upon reason of *state*, the *validity* of her *mother's mariage*, and consequently her *legitimation* depending upon the acknowledgment of the *Pope's absolute power* in this *Nation*.

4. But the truth is, her *opinion* or *practice* is of no more force one way, than the other, and therefore was taken in as a *supernumerary* observation, and not such as on that alone to found any *grand argument*.

5. As for the *power* of *refusing* a *Legate* from the *Pope*, I cannot discern how that is reconcileable with the *Popes* pretensions to *supreme* power in this Kingdome; Can it be lawfull for any *Province* to refuse a *Procurator*, or *Prætor*, or *Proconsul*, sent solemnly commissionated by the *Lawfull Prince*? Was it lawfull for the *tenants* or *dressers* of the *vineyard* to deny entrance to the *King's* son or but *servant*? Is not this a derogation to *supreme power* and *domination*? If this be *practiced* and counted *lawful in all Catholick times and Countreys*, this is to me an *indication*, that in no *time* or *countrey* there hath been *possession* of this *belief* that the *Pope* is the *supreme Pastor* of all, for sure if he were, his *Legate* which is his image, might in power of the *original* require *admission*, and he that is πεμπόμενος ἀπ' αὐτοῦ thus *sent* and *commissionated by him*, must by S. *Peter's* precept be allowed *obedience* from all his *subjects*, and so from that *Queen*, if such she were, and such she *must* be, so farre as he had the *supremacy*.

6. So again when *Cardinal Petou* was sent to be *Bishop* of *Sarisbury*, the denying him that *Bishoprick* was a check to the *Pope's* absolute *supremacy*, but of that this *Gentleman* was in prudence to take no notice.

Sect.

Sect. III.

King Edward *his Reformation. The Duke of* Somerſet. *The Duke of* Northumberland, *his Treaſon no prejudice to the Reformation under that King.*

Num. 1. HIs next exception is to the paſſages concerning *King Edward* VI. *King Henry*'s immediate ſucceſſor, Thus,

2. *King* Edward *a childe of nine years old fell into the hands of wicked and ambitious traytors, who knowing the Kingdome affected for religion-ſake to Queen* Mary, *to cut off her ſucceſſion, and introduce their own, thought fit to ſtrengthen their faction, which beſide what they might hope from abroad, conſiſted of many Lutherans and Calviniſts at home: thoſe two ſects having by opportunity of that rupture in* Henry *VIII. his time, ſpread and neſtled themſelves in many parts of* England.

3. What is here ſaid hath little of *truth* in it, and as little of *argument*, if it were *truth*. That the *youth* of the *Prince* can be no *foundation* of *argument* againſt the *Legality* of what was done by the *Duke* of *Somerſet* his *uncle*, the *Protector*, in his *nonage*, was ſufficiently ſhewed before, and might be exemplified through all *times* and *places*. That this *Protector* ſhould at this time, when the young *King* legally *fell* into his *hands*, be ſtyled a *wicked ambitious Traytor*, hath not any *degree* of *truth* in it, the *crime*, for which he afterward loſt his *life*, being farre from any *diſloyalty* to his *Sovereign*.

4. As for the *Duke* of *Northumberland*, who obtained the *King*'s conſent to ſettle the *inheritance* on *Jane Grey*, and accordingly, after the *King*'s death, proclaimed her *Queen*, and ſuffered as a *traytor* for ſo doing, all that I ſhall need to ſay is this, 1. that this *act* of his, how *trayterous* ſoever, cannot juſtifie what is here ſaid, that the *King* at *nine years old fell into the hands of traytors*, for that *one Duke* cannot truly be called *traytors* in the *plural*, and the *King* at that *age* did not *fall* into his *hands*, but into the hands of *Edward Seymour Duke* of *Somerſet*, under whom the *ſix Articles* and other *acts* of *ſeverity* againſt the *Proteſtants* were called in, and the *Acts* againſt the *Papal authority confirmed*, the *Romiſh*

Maſſe

Masse abrogated, the *Bible translated*, and publisshed in the *English tongue*, the *Liturgie reformed*, and the publick *offices* performed in *English*, the *sacrament* of the *Lord's Supper* administred in *both kindes* &c. And so whatsoever was afterward done (were it never so *trayterously*) by the *Duke* of *Northumberland*, could have no *influence* on this change, and is therefore very *impertinently* here inserted, after the manner of the *Orator*, not the *historian*, to raise *passions*, inflame *dislkes* and *aversions* in the *Reader*, and not to give him any exact view of the *truth* of the *story*.

5. *Secondly*, that the designe of the *Duke* of *Northumberland* not succeeding, but costing him so dear, the losse of his own *life* and hers, whom he set up to be *Queen*, and the *succession* regularly descending on *Queen Mary*, there can be no reasonable account given, why this *treason* of that *Duke* should here be proposed as the one *considerable*, it being evident in the *story*, that all things were composed to the full *satisfaction* of *Queen Mary*, and just as they should have been, in case that *trayterous* attempt had never been made by that *Duke*.

6. To which I might adde, that this *treason* of his was founded on that very *act*, which in the next *paragraph* this *Gentleman* thinks fit to vouch as *authentick*, and if it were so, that could be no *treason* in that *Duke*, viz: the *Act* whereby *Mary* as well as *Elizabeth* were adjudged *illegitimate*, and so *uncapable* of the *succession*. But these are *considerations* very *extrinsecal* and *remote* from the matter, as it lies here in the *conteſt* between us.

7. I shall onely, for conclusion, observe, that if, as he saith, the *Kingdome* were for *Religion's* sake affected to *Queen Mary*, it could not certainly be skilfull, or *popular*, or any way *Politick* in them that thus desired to strengthen themselves, to introduce this *change* in *Religion*. For whatsoever *aid* they might hope for, either from *Lutherans* or *Calvinists* at home or abroad, sure they might have *hoped* for *more* by the other way, if it be true what he affirms of the *Kingdome* indefinitely, that it was *affected* to *Queen Mary's Religion*. For that other *Kingdomes* of *Europe* generally were so at that time, there is small *question*.

Sect.

Sect. III.

Queen Elizabeth's *illegitimacy anſwered. The unpolitickneſs of her Councels of Reforming.*

num. 1. NOW follows his *exceptions* to that part of the *ſtory* which concern *Queen Elizabeth*; The *firſt* by the by, Thus,

2. *Queen* Elizabeth *being by Act of Parliament recorded a Baſtard, and ſo pronounced by two Popes, and therefore miſtruſting all her Catholick ſubjects, who ſhe feared did adhere to the Queen of* Scots *title, in which ſhe was then likely to be ſupported by the King of* France *her husband, was by the advice of men partly infected with Calviniſme or Lutheraniſme, partly ambitious of making their fortunes, caſt upon that deſperate counſel of changing religion; deſperate I ſay, for ſee amongſt what a number of rocks ſhe was, in conſequence of that Counſel forced to ſail, witneſs her adhering to the rebels of all her neighbour Kings, ſo provoking them thereby, as if the* French *King had not been taken out of this world, and winde and weather fought againſt the* Spaniſh Armado, *in all likelihood ſhe had been ruined, eſpecially her Catholick ſubjects being ſo provoked as they were, by moſt cruell and bloody Laws: but this by the by: though from hence the Reader may judge of reaſon of changing religion in her time, and what a ſolid foundation the Church of* England *hath.*

3. That *Queen Elizabeth* was *by Act of Parliament recorded a baſtard*; hath no farther truth in it, than is of force againſt *Queen Mary* alſo, The ſame *Act* of *Parliament* affirming the *mariages* with *Queen Katharine*, and *Anne* of *Bolen* void, and their *children Mary* and *Elizabeth illegitimate*, and ſo involving them *equally* under the ſame *cenſure.*

4. Nay, if there were any force in this (as this *Gentleman* by mentioning it is obliged to think there is) it muſt be much more to *Queen Maries* diſadvantage, for 'tis certain that upon the *birth* of *Queen Elizabeth*, 'twas enacted by *Parliament*, that the *mariage* with *Katharine* was *null*, becauſe *inceſtuous*, and ſo this with *Anne* lawfull (which certainly it

was, if the former was *inceſtuous* and the *reſolution* of the *Univerſities* and moſt *learned* men, not onely in *England*, but at *Paris*, and elſewhere was, that it was of ſuch a *nature*, as it could not by the *Pope's power* be *diſpenſed* with, being ſo contrary to the *law* of *God)* and by the ſame *act Elizabeth* is declared *heir* of the *Kingdome*, in caſe the *King* ſhould have no heir *male*, and *Oath* of *Allegiance* taken to the *King* and to his *heirs* by *Anne* the *mother* of *Elizabeth*. And to conclude, the ſubſequent *act*, that decreed the *ſucceſſion*, and eſtabliſht it firſt in *Edward*, then in *Mary*, then in *Elizabeth*, by which it was that *Mary* did actually aſcend to the *throne*, was equally favourable to both of them.

6. And ſo ſtill if any thing were to be *concluded* from this *Gentleman's proœmial* conſideration, it ſtill lies more againſt *Queen Mary*, than againſt *Queen Elizabeth*, if not in reſpect of the *merit* of the cauſe (on which this *Gentleman* will give me leave to ſuppoſe it was, that our *ſtories* tell us, that the *Pope* had given *Cardinal Campeius* his *Legate* a *private Bull*, much in favour of the *King's pretenſions*, but kept it under ſome *reſtraint* till he ſaw how the *Emperour's* affairs in *Italy* would ſucceed) yet in reſpect of the *ſeveral declarations* againſt the *one*, and but *one* onely againſt the *other*, and that how well founded, is eaſie to diſcern, if this were a place for ſuch *diſputes*.

7. But it is not ſo, much leſſe for the other *Politick* conſiderations that here follow, whether the *counſel* of re-excluding the *Papacy*, and proceeding to a farther *Reformation* in her *Kingdomes*, were a *deſperate Counſel* or no, For if to this *Gentleman's arguments* I ſhall grant it were ſo, the *concluſion* will be onely this, that her *action* was *unskilful* in *ſecular* conſiderations, from which it is no way conſequent, that it was more than, as *Prince*, ſhe had power to doe, or *impious* in the ſight of *God*, or that that, which being built on ſo feeble a *foundation*, proved yet competently *ſucceſsfull*, is by this means concluſible to have been *unlawful* and *null*, for in that alone can be founded the truth of the *ſuggeſtion* here, that we that *adhere* to her *Reformation*, muſt be adjudged *ſchiſmaticks*.

Sect.

Sect. IV.

The Ordination of Biſhops in Queen Elizabeths *time. Mr.* Maſons *Record. Introducing of Turciſme.*

Num. 1. WHat remaines on this head of *Queen Elizabeth*, as the *narration* after this long *Proœme*, the ἔγγον after an acknowledged (yet at large) πάρεργον, will be ſoone diſpatch't; It is thus,

2. *How far Maſter* Maſon *can juſtifie the ordination of Queen* Elizabeths *Biſhops, I will not now examine; but certaine it is, that the Record (if there be ſuch an one) hath a great prejudice of being forged, ſince it lay ſome fifty years unknowne amongſt the Clamors againſt the flagrant act, and no permiſſion given to Catholikes to examine the ingenuity of it, but howſoever it is nothing to our purpoſe, for whatſoever material miſſion they had by an external conſecration, thoſe Biſhops, who are ſaid to have conſecrated them, are not ſo much as pretended to have given them order to preach the Doctrine, or exerciſe the Religion they after did, which is the true meaning and effect of miſſion. I cannot end without noting in his 24. Parag: the foundation upon what he himſelfe ſaies his whole deſigne relies; which is, that becauſe the receſſion from the Roman Church was done by thoſe, by whom, and to whom onely the power of right belonged legally,* viz *the King and Biſhops of this Nation, therefore it is no Schiſme, that is, whatſoever the reaſon of dividing hath been, even to turne Turkes, or for violating never ſo fundamental points of Religion, yet it had not been Schiſme.*

3. What *Mr. Maſons Records* are, and of how good and unqueſtionable *authority*, I leave to the *view* of his *Book*, which ſets downe all ſo *particularly*, and irrefragably, that nothing can be more *contrary* to the *Gentlemans* intereſts, than the moſt ſtrict *examination* of that whole matter, in order to the *vindicating* and *juſtifying* this truth, that the *ſucceſſion* of *Biſhops*, and *order Eccleſiaſtical* hath been regularly preſerved in our *Church*, at that time, when alone the *Romaniſt* accuſeth us for the *interruption* of it, *i. e.* in *Queen Elizabeths reformation.* (To which head of diſcourſe it is not amiſſe to

adde the *resolution* of *Cudsemius* the *Jesuite*, *de desper: Calvini causâ*, *cap.* 11. that the *English Nation* are not *Hereticks*, becaufe they *remain in a perpetual fucceffion of Bifhops.*)

4. Which being the onely thing that in that *Sect.* 16. I purpofed to conclude from Mr. *Majons* worke, and the *Records* by him produced, it lyes not on me to prove that they which ordained thofe *Queen-Eilzabeth-Bifhops*, gave them *order* to *preach the Doctrine they after did*, or to examine the truth of his *fuggeftion*, that this is the true *meaning* and *effect* of *Miffion*. It may fuffice that they which *confecrated* them, gave them the fame *power* which themfelves derived by *fucceffion* from the *Apoftles*, and that was fufficient to *authorize* them to preach all *Apoftolical* doctrine, and if they preacht any other, let it appeare, and I fhall never juftifie their *preaching*. But that is not attempted here, and therefore I have herein no farther matter, that exacts *reply* from me.

5. For as to his parting blow, which he *cannot omit*, in *reply* to *Sect.* 20. certainly it hath little *impreffion* on my difcourfe in that place, which doth not inquire what is *unlawful* or *criminous Univerfally*, for then fure I fhould have acknowledged that the bringing in *Turcifme*, or *violating fundamental points of Religion* had been fuch, but peculiarly and *precifely* this, what is *Schifme*, in that one notion of *Schifme*, as that is a *voluntary feparation* from our *Eccleffiaftical Superiours*; of which that we are not, or cannot be guilty, when we act in perfect *concord*, compliance and fubordination to all thofe to whom the *right* of *fuperiority* legally belonged, is I fuppofe, fo manifeft, that it can need no farther *proof*.

6. As for any fuch act of *lawful Superiors* in bringing in *Turcifme*, or *violating fundamental points*, I fhould not be apt to ftyle that *Schifme* (any more than I would call *perjury*, *lying*, or *inceft*, fimple *fornication*) it being in the firft part of the inftance, *Apoftafie* and *total* defection from *Chrift*, which I hope is a little more than denying the *Popes Univerfal Paftorfhip*, or *Infallibility* of the *Church* (in which confifts his grand *fpecies* of *Schifme*) and in the *fecond*, *Herefie*, and the groffeft fort of *Schifme* together, that of *departing* from

the

the *unity* of the *Faith*, which being by me *Chap.* 8. diſtinctly handled, as a ſecond *ſpecies* of *ſchiſme*, all that I need here ſay to this *Gentleman*'s exception, is, that I indevoured to ſpeak as *diſtinctly*, and not as *confuſedly* as I could, and therefore did not mix things that were *diſtant*, and therefore did not ſpeak of that ſecond *kinde* of *ſchiſme* at the ſame time when I propoſed to ſpeak of the *firſt* onely, and upon this account onely ſaid nothing to it in that *Chapter*. And I hope this was but my duty to doe, agreeably to all rules of *method*, and ſo that he might very well have ſpared that *animadverſion* which he ſaith he could *not end without noting*.

Chap. VIII.

An Answer to the Exceptions made to the eighth Chapter.

Sect. I.

The Division of Schisme. An Answer to many Questions about Schism, A retortion.

Num. 1. IN proceeding to the view of *Chap.* 8. this *Gentleman* without any cause is pleased to change the *division* of the *second sort* of *schisme* there handled, into another, which it seems was more sutable to his *understanding*, and then to make two light *skirmishes* against the discourse of that *Chapter*. He begins thus,

2. *In his* 8th *Chapter, as farre as I understand, he divideth Schisme into formal, that is, breach of unity; and material, that is, breach of Doctrine or Customes, in which the Church was united: the former he brancheth into subordination to the*

Sect. 4. *Pope, of which enough hath been said; and breach of the way provided by Christ for maintaining the unity of faith, the which*

Sect. 5. *he puts in many subordinations without any effect, For let us ask, if inferior Clergie-men dissent from their own Bishops, but not from their Metropolitan, in matter of faith, is it Schisme? he will answer, No: If a Metropolitan dissent from his Primate, but agree with the rest of the Patriarchs, is it schisme? I think he must say, No: If a Patriarch dissent from the first, but agree with the rest, is it schisme? No: If a Nation or a Bishop dissent from the rest of the General Councel, is it schism? still I believe he will answer, No: Where then is schisme provided against? or where truly is there any subordination in Faith? if none of these are subject, and bound to their Superiors or Universals in matters of faith?*

[What

3. What my *diviſion* there is, will be obvious enough to any man's *underſtanding*. In the third *Chap:* the *foundation* had been laid in the *oppoſition* betwixt *Schiſme* and *Eccleſiaſtical Unity*, and as the *unity* was the conſerving all due *relations*, whether of *ſubordination*, or *equality*, wherein each member of *Chriſt's Church* is concerned one toward another, ſo there were two *prime* branches of *ſchiſme*, the one againſt the *ſubordination* which *Chriſt* ſetled in his *Church*, the ſecond againſt the *mutual charity*, which he left as his *Legacy* among *Chriſtians*. And the former of theſe being diſcuſſed at large in order to the *preſent* debate, in the 8. *Chapter*, the method led me to the latter of them, to conſider *Schiſme*, as it is an *offence* againſt the *mutual unity*, Peace, and Charity, which *Chriſt* left, and preſcribed among *Chriſtians*; And that I might be ſure not to *ſtreighten* the bounds of this ſort of *Schiſm*, or omit any thing, that can, by any rule of *diſcourſe*, be placed in the *borders* or *confines* of it, by the meanes either to lay *charge* on us, or render our *Vindication* the clearer, I diſtributed it into as many parts, as in my opinion the matter could by any be thought to beare, *i. e.* into *three ſpecies*,

1. A *breach* in the *Doctrines* or *Traditions* (together with the *inſtitutions* of *Chriſt*, his *Apoſtles*, and the *Primitive Church*, whether in *government*, or *obſervances*.)

2. An *offence* againſt *external peace* or *communion Eccleſiaſtical*.

3. The *want* of that *Charity* which is due from every *Chriſtian* to every *Chriſtian*.

The fitſt of theſe againe *ſubdivided* and *conſidered*, 1. in the *groſſe*, as it is a *departing* from the *rules* appointed by *Chriſt* for the *founding* and upholding *unity* of *Doctrine*, &c. 2. in *particular*, the aſſerting of any *particular* doctrine, contrary to *Chriſt's* and the *Apoſtolical* pure *Churches* eſtabliſhment.

4. The *Scheme* being thus laid as *regular*, and as *comprehenſive*, as I could deviſe. 1. here is not one word ſaid to expreſſe any cauſe of *diſlike* or *exception* to it; and yet 2. it is quite laid aſide, and another of *formal* and *material* Schiſme, &c. ſubſtituted inſtead of it, upon what *temptation* or *deſigne*, ſave

ſave onely a *willingneſſe* to gaine ſomewhat by the *ſhuffle* and *confuſion*, more than the *diſtinctneſſe* of *diſcourſe* could yeild him, I cannot divine.

5. As it is, I yet diſcern not the *particular advantages* he had in his *intuition*, but ſuppoſe them *latent* and *reſerved*; For to his ſpecial *diſcovery* that he means to make by *asking* (and ſuppoſing anſwers to) many *qneſtions* proportionable to the ſeveral links in the *ſubordination*, the account will be eaſie enough, that as long as any *particular Biſhop* remains in the due *ſubordination* to his *Canonical ſuperiors*, ſo long the departure of any *clergie* man that is under his *jurisdiction*, from that *obedience* which *Canonically* he owes him, is in him that is thus guilty of it, an act of *ſchiſme*.

6. But then 1. when inſtead of *departure* he puts *diſſent* (which may belong to *light* matters, wherein liberty of *diſſent* from *Superiors*, is yeilded to all men, or to *greater* matters, without departing from *obedience* or *Communion*) this is not fairly done, this difference having a viſible influence on the matter.

7. *Secondly*, when of the *inferiour clergie*-man's *diſſent* from his own *Biſhop*, he makes me anſwer that it is not *ſchiſme*, if it be not from his *Metropolitan*, I never gave him my letter of *Proxie* to doe ſo: But on the other ſide, if the *diſſent* be ſuppoſed to be improved into a *departure* (which alone makes *ſchiſme*) I ſhall not doubt to pronounce it *ſchiſme*, unleſſe he have firſt made his *appeal* from his *Biſhop* to his *Metropolitan*, and by him and his *Councel* of *Biſhops* be adjudged to be in the *right*, and then if his *Biſhop* by that *judgment* be reduced to order, he may not, he cannot again without *ſchiſme depart* from him.

8. *Thirdly*, when from *Primates* he aſcends to *Patriarchs*, as if that *latter* had a *power ſuperiour* to the *former*, and again from the *Patriarchs* to the *firſt Patriarch*, i. e. the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, this he knows hath no place with us, who acknowledge no power of any *Patriarch* above a *Primate*, no *ſupremacie* over all in the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, but yet allow them and him (proportionably to the Πρῶτος Σίμων, if that will content him) that *Primacie* of *order*, which by the *antient Canons*, is allowed them.

Fourthly,

9. *Fourthly*, whatſoever concerning theſe ſeveral ſteps from the *loweſt Clergie man* to the *firſt* of *Patriarchs*, he phanſies to be anſwered by us; and from thence concludes, that then *ſchiſm is no way provided againſt*, is viſibly much more true of any *Romaniſt*; For certainly if he *diſſent* not from the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, it muſt be no *ſchiſme*, in him though he *diſſent* from his own *Biſhop*, his own *Archbiſhop*, *Primate*, and *Patriarch*, and if he doe *diſſent* from him, 'tis not his conſenting with all his *inferior Governors*, that will ſtand him in ſtead for his *vindication*.

10. And therefore if what he hath formed againſt me by his making *anſwer* himſelf to his own *queſtions*, be found really to conclude (as he ſaith it doth) againſt all *ſubordination*, 'tis now evident, who is moſt blameable for it, he doubtleſſe, that hath divolved all into the *Monarchike ſupremacy* of the *Pope*, and permits us not to conſider, what any other our *immediate ſuperiors* require of us.

11. *Laſtly*, what he puts into my mouth by way of *anſwer*, concerning *ſubordination* to a *General Councel*, that if a *nation* or *Biſhop diſſent from the reſt of a General Councel*, *ſtill it is not ſchiſme*, unleſſe, as I ſaid, there be deceit in ſubſtituting the word *Diſſent*, for *Departure* or *Receſſion*, I ſhall no way acknowledge the *anſwer* which he *believes* I will make; For certainly I acknowledge, as much as he, or any man, the *authority* of a *General Councel* againſt the *diſſents* of a *nation*, much more of a particular *Biſhop*. And theſe were *miſadventures* enough to be noted in one *Paragraph*.

Sect. II.

The ſufficiency of the few heads reſolved on by the Apoſtles. The notion of Fundamentals. The Canon of Epheſus *concerning it. The definition of the Councel of* Florence. *Many Churches have not betrayed this truſt. Chriſtian practice to be ſuper-added. The few things preſerved by Tradition.*

§. 1. NExt he proceeds to another part of the *diſcourſe* of that *Chapter*, concerning the *heads* reſolved on by the *Apoſtles*,

postles, in order to *planting Christian* life, and to that he thus offers his *exceptions*.

2. *But, saith the Doctor, the Apostles resolved upon some few heads of special force and efficacy to the planting of Christian life through the world, and preaching and depositing them in every Church of their plantation. Truly I doe not know what a Catholick professeth more, so that by the word few, he meaneth enough to forme a Religion, and Christian life, and will shew us a Church which hath not betrayed the trust deposited; for if there be none, what availeth this depositing? if there be any, cleare it is that it preserved it by Tradition; if there be a question whether it hath or no, against I demand to what purpose was the depositing, so that if the Doctor would speak aloud, I doubt he would be subject to as much jealousie, as he saith* Grotius *was.*

3. That what I affirme, as he confesseth *conformably*, to the *Catholikes profession*, may be as full and *explicite* as he can desire, I doubt not to expresse my meaning to be, that the *few heads*, that the *Apostles* resolved on, were sufficient both for *number* and *efficacy*, or in * *Athanasius* his language, ἀυτάρκεις πρὸς ἀναίρεσιν πάσης ἀσεβείας, σύσασιν δὲ εὐσεβείας ἐν Χριστῷ, *sufficient for the averting all impiety, and establishment of all piety in Christ*; And for his satisfaction therein, I referre him to the *Treatise* of *Fundamentals*, printed since that of *Schisme*, of which the *onely* designe was to insist on this, as the *grand* notion of *Fundamentals*, such as were by the *Apostles* and *Christ* himselfe, deemed most proper and *effectual* to plant *Christian* life in a world of *Jewes*, and *Gentiles*, and briefly to set downe and enumerate all those that the *Apostles* thought *thus* necessary.

* *Epist. ad Epict.*

4. To which I shall now adde one *observation*, that this *sufficiency* of the *foundation* by them laid and somewhat explained (on occasion of *Heretical* opposers) by the *Councel* of *Nice*, &c. was such, that the *Ephesine Councel* following that of *Nice*, 106. yeares, made a decree, ἑτέραν πίστιν μηδενὶ ἐξεῖναι προφέρειν ἢ γράφειν, ἢ συντιθέναι παρὰ τὴν ὁρισθεῖσαν, &c. *that it should not be lawfull for any man to produce, write, or compose any beliefe beside that which was established by the Fathers*

Fathers at Nice, *and that they which should dare to compose or offer any such to any that would from Gentilisme, Judaisme, or whatever Heresie convert to the ackcowledgment of the truth, if they were Bishops, should be deposed from their Bishopricks, if Laymen, anathematised,* &c. *Can.* 7.

5. And this *authority* being prest by the *Greeks* to the *Latines*, in the *Council* of * *Florence*, and that with this *smart expression*, οὐδεὶς ἐγκαλέσει ἀτέλειαν πίστεως, εἰ μὴ τις εἴη μαινόμενος, *No man will accuse the Faith* (that which those *Fathers* had profest) or *charge it of imperfection, unlesse he be mad, Concil. l.7.p.642.A.* The *Latines* answer is but this, that that *Canon* did not *forbid*, ἑτέραν ἔκθεσιν σύμφωνον τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἐν τῇ πίστει, *another explication agreeable to the truth contained in that Crede*, acknowledging that it did forbid διαφορὰν καὶ ἐναντιότητα, *difference* as well as *contrariety* (pag.644.b) and even for such a *bare explication* they counted not *that* lawfull for any but the *Fathers convened* in *OEcumenical Synods*, citing it from *Aquinas, 2a. 2a. qu: 1:ar.10.* and adding that he spake, περὶ ὁτινοσοῦν συμβόλου. ὅπερ ἦν κοινὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, *of any Creed whatsoever which was common to the* whole *Church.* * *Sess.* 10. *Ib.p.641.D.*

6. And accordingly there followes out of the *Epistle* of *Celestine* to *Nestorius*, ἡ πίστις ἡ παραδοθεῖσα παρὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων, οὔτε προσθήκην οὔτε μείωσιν ἀπαιτεῖ, *The beliefe delivered by the Apostles requires neither addition nor diminution.* *Ib.p.644. D.*

7. In all which, how they are concerned, who *impose* so many *new articles* of *beliefe* upon their owne *Churches*, and upon all that desire *Communion* with them, I leave to each *Romanist* to consider, ann shall onely adde the words of the *Catechism* taken out of the workes of *Costerus*, *Petrus de Soto*, and others, and set out by command of the *Archbishop of Triers, resp.ad 2. qu. Neque ulla unquam ex titit hæresis, quæ non hoc symbolo damnari potuerit, There was never any Heresie which might not be condemned by the Apostles Creed.* It were well we might be allowed the *benefit* of this *tryal.*

8. And now having given this *pledge* of my *readinesse* to answer his *questions*, though I discern not any *obligation*, arising from my *former* discourse, to lye upon me, yet I shall not be

so *nice* or sparing of my paines, as to deny him a clear account also of his subseqnent demands, but shall speak as *loud* as he would wish, and tell him first to the *first* demand, that as to those *few* heads I spoke of, I can, blessed be *God*, shew him *Churches* enough, which have not *betrayed* the *trust deposited*; The *Church* of *England*, even now, under the *saddest* persecution, hath not been *tempted* to *betray* that *trust*, the *Church* of *Rome*, through all the *Prosperity* and *Splendor*, and *Grandeur*, which it hath long injoyed, and which, the *Historian* tells us, *acrioribus stimulis animum explorant*, hath as yet held out *thus farre*: I meane hath retainnd those *few heads*, and in that respect is not accused by us to have *betrayed* that *trust* (I wish it were as *blameless* in all things else, particularly in that wherein our present debate is most concerned, in imposing *new Articles* of *Faith* on all *Christians*, and her own *infallibility* for the *first* of them.)

9. The same I can as freely affirm of all other *National Churches*, that I know of, confining my discourse still to the small (yet in the *Apostles* opinions *sufficient*) number of *heads* of *special* force to the *planting* of *Christian life* through the world.

10. And so as this *Gentleman* is much disappointed in his expectation, that I should not be able to name any *Church* that hath not *betrayed* the trust *deposited*, so I must professe to him, I think it as reasonable, that they that agree in *believing* and *conserving* those few *pretious* heads of truth, designed to so *glorious* an end, as is the *peopling* a world with a *peculiar colonie* of inhabitants, all uniformly *zealous of good workes*, should all joyne *hands* and *hearts*, to adde that superstructure to the *foundation*, pure, immaculate, *Elevated*, *Heroical*, i.e. *Christian* practice, to the *untainted* beliefe of these *few* things.

11. And then how much blame (by force of that *Canon* of *Ephesus*) most justly belongs unto them that make it their great interest to *quarrel*, divide from, and *anathematize*, all others, who cannot *believe* all other things which they chance to *believe*, though they know they *agree* with them in all that the *Apostles* thus thought necessary to be *agreed* in; & indeed how contrary this is, and destructive to *this superstructure*, of which *Charity* in one principall *ingredient*, and so to the *designe* of lay-

laying the *foundation*, though not to the *foundation* it ſelfe, I ſhall leave this *Gentleman* and every ſober *Chriſtian* to conſider, and if he judge not as I doe, yet I ſhall not ξενίζεσθαι number it among the *prodigies* of the *age*, or indeed thinke *ſtranger* of it, than I have long done of the great *diſtance* betwixt *Reaſon* and *Paſſion* in the ſame ſort of creatures, *Man*, and (*God* knowes too oft) in the ſame *Individual* creature, the ſame *Man* and *Chriſtian*.

12. Having gone thus farre in ready obedience to this *Gentlemans* lighteſt intimation of his pleaſure, in *ſatisfaction* to his *firſt* demand, I ſhall in the ſame humour proceed without all reſerve to the next, doubting as little as he; but that theſe *few* things (all *juſtice* muſt allow our diſcourſe to he *coherent*, and ſo to adhere to the ſame *ſubject* with which we began) *have been preſerved in each Church by Tradition*, and then to the third, that there is no place of *doubt* concerning the *fact*, and ſo of *queſtion*, whether they have or no, and if by thus *ſpeaking aloud* to every of his demands, I render my ſelfe *ſubject to as much jealouſie as I ſay* Grotius *was*, I ſhall not accuſe him as my *tempter*, but onely ſupport and *comfort* my ſelf, that I have retained as much innocence as I alwaies thought *Grotius* had done, and by declaring my meaning thus *clearly*, and *profeſſing* that I mean no whit more than I ſay, I ſee no place for *jealouſie* remaining to any.

13. If to *believe* the *Apoſtles Creed* to be conveyed down to us by *tradition* in every *national Church* from the *Apoſtles* time to this, be any *hereſie*, I am viſibly guilty of it, and need not have my words put upon the *rack* (as *Grotius*'s have been) to *extort* a more explicite *confeſſion* from them.

Sect. III.

Submission without opinion of infallibility. The appeal to the Fathers of the first 300 years, and the four General Councels, to what it belongs. The silence of the first times no advantage to the Romanist. Two Questions of Additaments to Faith; The way of debating each of them.

Num. 1. HIS last *exception* to this *Chapter* is to our *profession* of *humility* and *temper*, which it seems those of our *religion* must not be permitted to *assume* to themselves (and which I was no farther so *insolent* to *assume*, than as it is observable in the peculiarity of the *frame* of the *Church* of *England*'s *Reformation*) Thus,

2. *I cannot but admire indeed the great temper he professeth men of his religion have, in choosing of Doctrines, to wit, their submission to the three first Ages, and the four first Councels, but I confesse it is a humility I understand not, first to professe, they know not whether their teachers say true or no (that is, that they are fallible) and then to hold under pain of damnation what they say. Another piece of their humility is in submitting to ages, where very few witnesses can be found, in regard of the rarity of the Authors and the little occasion they had to speak of present controversies. A third note of humility is, that whereas the fourth Councel was held about the midst of the fift Age, these lovers of truth will stand to it, but not to the fourth Age precedent, or that very Age in which it was held, so humble they are to submit to any authority, that toucheth not the questions in present controversie, but where doe they finde Christ's Church shall be judge in three Ages, and fail in the fourth, or that the Councels in the fift Age shall be sound, but not the Fathers.*

3. It is very hard, it seems, to please this *Gentleman*. Our *humility* is one while by him censured as really *too great*, another while the *want* of it is our *crime*, and we equally to be *scoffed* at on both accounts.

4. It is a *criminous* excesse of *humility* forsooth, to *submit* to those, of whom we first professe not to *know* that they are

in-

infallible. But as long as we doe verily believe they doe actually *affirm* truth, why may we not *ſubmit* to them, though we *know* not that they are *infallible* ? For certainly I may *ſubmit* to my *natural*, or *civil parent* in this manner, *obey* him in all his *commands* (ſuppoſing, as now I doe, that none of his *commands* are by me apprehended to be *unlawful*, as none of theſe *Councels definitions*, as by us believed to be, contrary to the Word and Will of *God*) though yet I neither account him *inerrable* nor *impeccable*. But of this I have ſpoken already *Chap*: I. *Sect*. 3.

5. What he adds of *holding under pain of damnation what they ſay*, is in this place an *inſertion* of this *Gentleman's*, no word being ſaid of it in that *ſection*, to which his words are confronted, and having elſewhere ſpoken to that, I abſtain from *adding* more at this time.

6. In the next place it ſeems our *humility* is too *ſcanty*, for when I have *ſubmitted* to be judged by the *ſcriptures*, the *conſent* of the *firſt* 300 years, or the *four General Councels*, whether we have departed from the *Apoſtolical doctrines* or *traditions*, this, ſaith he, is *ſubmitting* to *Ages* where very *few* witneſſes can be found &c. But I deſire it may be remembred, what there I ſpeak of, (for perhaps this *Gentleman's* haſte hath not permitted him to advert to it) the *conteſting* or *innocence* in this, that we of the *Church* of *England* have not *departed* from the *Apoſtolick doctrine* and *traditions*; And for this whether could the *appeal* more properly be directed, than to the *ſcriptures*, the *Conſervatorie* of the *Apoſtles written* doctrine, and the *three* firſt *Centuries*, the *conſervatorie* of their *traditions*, It being unimaginable that any thing ſhould be ſo *per ſaltum* conveyed to us from the *Apoſtles*, as to *leap* over thoſe three *Centuries* next to them, without leaving any footſtep *diſcernible* among them.

7. For let the *witneſſes* of thoſe times, the *authors* that remain to us be never ſo *few*, yet unleſſe by ſome of their *hands* we be directed what the *Apoſtles* delivered to them, how can we know what was *delivered* ? It being all one in this reſpect not to *be*, as not to *appear*, *Tradition*, even *Apoſtolical*, being no more than an *empty* name, unleſſe we ſuppoſe our ſelves able

able to *avouch* ſome competent *teſtifiers* of the *Tradition.*

8. And if to theſe two, I have added the *four General Councels*, becauſe they were held againſt the great *diſturbers* of the *unity* of the *Faith*, and they maintained the *true* faith by theſe *two* ſpecial *weapons*, the *Scriptures* and *Tradition*, teſtified by the *firſt Writers*, and our *Church* hath taken in their *Creeds* into our *Liturgies*, and their *definitions* into our *Articles* of *religion*, and ſo I have by that *appeal* ſo farre teſtified our *non-departure* from the *Faith*, I hope there is no *offence* in this, no degree of *defect* in our *humility*.

9. As for the *little occaſion* theſe *firſt* had to *ſpeak* of the *preſent controverſies*, that ſure cannot be *objected* againſt our *procedure* (any more than the *paucity* of the *Authors* could) for if the *Romaniſt* doe but grant this one thing, it will be found a *real prejudice* to his *pretenſions*, if (which was the point in hand) the *queſtion* be, whether the *Church* of *England* have *departed* from the *unity* of the *Apoſtolick Faith*, denied any *Apoſtolick Doctrine* or *Tradition.*

10. For in this *Controverſie* how ſhall it be proved, that we have *departed*, unleſſe that *Doctrine* or *Tradition* being ſpecified what it is, it be evidenced alſo, that it was *delivered* by the *Apoſtles*, and how can that be evidenced, but by thoſe which within ſome competent diſtance of their time, affirm that from them, and how can they be pretended to *affirm* that, if it be granted of them that they had no *occaſion* to *ſpeak* of it, and ſo are utterly *ſilent* in it.

11. To his laſt note of *humility* i. e. the next expreſſion of his *ſcoptical* humor, there can be no need of applying any anſwer, it being no where intimated in that *Treatiſe* that we are not ready to ſtand to the *fourth Age*, or that wherein the *fourth Councel* was held; All that was ſaid, was, that the three *firſt Ages*, and the *four General Councels* were *competent* witneſſes of the *Apoſtolical doctrines* and *traditions*, and I deſire any man to name any other that were more *competent* to this purpoſe, i.e. to *teſtifie* what the *Apoſtles* taught, It being certain that whoſoever doth (not by *inſpiration*) tell us any thing of that kinde, muſt aſſume to tell it from them, and as *evident* that all thoſe things (that even now were

were ſpoken of) which the *Apoſtles* reſolved on, as *heads* of *ſpecial* force to form *religion* and *Chriſtian* life, were by this means conveyed to us.

12. Mean while other *matters* there are, which we look on as *additaments* to the *doctrines* of *Faith*, and ſo are the *ſubject* of a *double queſtion*, 1. whether they be parts of that *faith* which was *once*, or *at once delivered to the ſaints*, 2. whether not appearing to be ſo, there be any other juſt *reaſon* to *believe*, though but by an *humane* Faith, that they have any *truth* in them.

13. Now of theſe two *queſtions*, as the *reſolution* of the *former* depends upon thoſe Ages, which alone can conveigh *Tradition* to the *ſucceeding*, and ſo ſtill for that we referre our ſelves to the former *Umpirage*, ſo of the *ſecond*, I did not then, becauſe I had not *occaſion* to ſpeak in that place.

14. And if my *anſwer* be required now, I ſhall readily give it, that in matters of this nature the *Opinions* of the *Fathers* of the *Church* in the moſt *flouriſhing Ages* of it, wherein their *writings* are moſt *voluminous*, and their *Learning* in *Theologie* moſt *venerable*, are with us of great *weight* and *conſideration*; we doe (and ſhall upon all occaſions demonſtrate our ſelves to) allow them as full an *authority*, pay as great and true a *reverence* to their *judgments*, indevour as uniformly to *conform* our ſelves to the *declarations* of their ſenſe, as any ſober *Romaniſts* are by us diſcerned to doe, or as it can be their intereſt to doe, in reſpect of the *controverſies* that lie between us. And ſo ſtill I diſcern not, wherein our *humility* can be judged to fail by thoſe, with whom I now *diſpute*, being content that it ſhould by *others* be judged *exceſſive*.

CHAP. IX.

An Answer to the Exceptions made to the ninth Chapter.

Sect. I.

The hinderances of Communion imputable to the Romanist, not to us. Siquis Ecclesiam non audierit, *one of our grounds. What is meant by* Ecclesia.

Num. 1. THE *Exceptions* to this *Chapter* are not very great, whether we respect their *weight* or *number*, yet upon the same account that the former have been our *exercise*, these may for a while detain us also.

2. *In his* 9th *Chap:* saith he, *he pretendeth the Roman Catholick Church is cause of this division, because they desire communion, and cannot be admitted, but under the belief and practice of things contrary to their consciences, of which two propositions, if the second be not proved, the first is vain, and is as if a subject should plead he is unjustly outlawed, because he doth not desire it: Now to prove the latter, he assumeth that the Protestant is ready to contest his Negatives, by grounds that all good Christians ought to be concluded by, what he means by that, I know not, for that they will convince their Negatives by any ground, a good Christian ought to be concluded by, I see nothing lesse.*

What then will they contest it by? all grounds a good orthodox Christian ought to be concluded by? If they answer in the Affirmative, we shall ask them whether siquis Ecclesiam non audierit *be one of their grounds, and if they say no, we shall clearly disprove their Major, but then their defence is, if any ground, or rule of it self firm and good, speaketh nothing clearly of a point in question, they will contest that point by those grounds, and is not this a goodly excuse?*

The

3. The deſigne of *Chap:9.* of the *Treatiſe* of *Schiſme*, is to vindicate us from all guilt of *ſchiſme*, as that ſignifies *offence* againſt *external peace* and *communion Eccleſiaſtical*, and it being certain that we exclude none from our *Communion*, that acknowledge the *foundation*, and that we deſire to be admitted to the like *freedome* of *external communion*, with all members of all other *Chriſtian Churches*, the reſult is viſible, that the hinderances, that obſtruct this *freedome*, are wholly imputable to the *Romaniſt*, ſuch are their *excommunicating* us, and impoſing *conditions* on their *communion*, ſuch as we cannot admit of without *ſin*, or *ſcandal*, acting contrary to *conſcience*, or making an *unſound confeſſion*.

4. To this all that is *anſwered* is, that unleſſe this ſecond be proved, *viz:* that ſuch *conditions* are by them impoſed on their *communion*, the *firſt*, that of our *deſire* of *Communion*, is *vain*; And to this I make no doubt to yeild, for if we may with a *good conſcience* be admitted to their *Communion*, and yet wilfully withdraw our ſelves from it, then I confeſſe there is no place for this plea of ours; But for the *conteſting* of this, there was not then, neither will there now be any place, without *deſcending* to the *ſeverals* in *difference* between us (which was beyond the deſigne either of thoſe, or theſe *Papers*) and therefore for that all that can be ſaid is, that we are ready to maintain our *Negatives*, by *grounds* that all *good Chriſtians* ought to be *concluded* by; And becauſe it is here askt, whether *ſiquis Eccleſiam non audierit* be one of thoſe *grounds*, I anſwer without *queſtion* it is, and ſo is every other *affirmation* of *Chriſt*, or the *Apoſtles*, however made known to us to be ſuch. And I cannot ſufficiently admire, why, when it is known to all *Romaniſts*, that we are ready to be *judged* by *Scripture*, and when it is certain that *ſiquis Eccleſiam non audierit*] are the words of *ſcripture*, he ſhould ſuppoſe (as here he doth) that we will ſay, *No:* i. e. that we will *refuſe* to be *tried* or *concluded* by that.

5. Here I muſt ſuppoſe that by *Eccleſiam* he underſtands the *Roman* (which he calls *Catholick*) *Church*; but then this interpretation or underſtanding of his, is one thing, and thoſe words of *Chriſt* are another, for they belonging to the

Church indefinitely, under which any man, that hath offended, is regularly placed, doe to a member of the particular *Roman Church* signifie that, as to an *Engliſh man* the *Church* wherein he lives, and that, is not the *Roman*, or the *Univerſal Church* of *God*, and that is more than the *Roman*.

6. And ſo by acknowledging that ground of *ſcripture*, we are no way *obliged* to *believe* all that that particular *Church* of *Rome*, to which we owe no *obedience* (and are as ready to *conteſt* that by the ſame means alſo) exacts of us.

7. As for our *conteſting* any *point* by that *ground* or *rule* which *ſpeaketh nothing clearly* of it, I gave him no *occaſion* to make any ſuch *objection* againſt us, and withall have ſaid what was *ſufficient* to it *Chap.8. Sect.3. n. 7.* and ſo need not here farther attend to it.

CHAP.

Chap. X.

An Answer to the Exceptions made to the tenth Chapter.

Sect. I.

The Romanists want of charity wherein it consists.

Num. 1. IN his view of *Chap:* 10. he takes notice of two *charges* by us brought in against them, 1. *judging*, 2. *despising* their *brethren*, but contents himself with a very brief reply, and that onely to one of them, Thus,

2. *In his* 10*th Chap:* he saith, *we judge them and despise them: as to the first I have often wondred, and doe now, that men, pretending to learning and reason, should therein charge us with want of charity, for if our judgment be false, it is error, not malice, and whether true or false, we presse it upon them out of love and kindnesse, to keep them from the harm, that according to our belief may come upon them, but since they deny they are Schismaticks, and offer to prove it, we must not say it: yet I think we ought, untill we have cause to believe them, since our higheſt tribunal, the Churches voice, from which we have no appeal, hath passed judgment against them.*

3. The want of *charity*, with which we charge the *Romanist* in this matter, is not their *warning* us of our *danger*, which may reasonably be interpreted *love*, and *kindness*, and *care* to keep us from *harm*, and if they erre in *admonishing*, when there is no *need* of it, there is nothing still but *charity* in this; but it is their *casting* us out of their *Communion* on this score, that we consent not to all their *Dictates*, that we withdraw our *obedience* from those, who without *right* usurped it over us, their *anathematizing* and *damning* us, and being no way perswadable to withdraw these *sanguinary Censures*, unless we will *change* or *dissemble* our *beliefs*, and as there cannot

be *charity* in this, any thing that can tend to the *mending* of any, for how can it be deemed any *act* of *reformation* in any, to forsake his present *perswasions*, whilst he is not convinced of any *error* in them, and surely the bare *damning* of us is not any such matter of *conviction*; so there is a double *uncharitableness*, 1. of being *angry* without *cause*, and expressing that *anger* in very *ill language*, of which that of *Heretick* and *Schismatick* is the mildest, and each of those *causelesse* too, if they be affixt to any *particular* man, much more to a *whole Church*, before either of them be sufficiently *proved* against us: For certainly as the *Romanist's judgment* concerning us, if it be *false*, may yet be but *error* not *malice* (by which this *Gentleman* here justifies himself from want of *charity*) so our *opinions* and *perswasions* of the *erroneousness* of their *doctrines* and *sinfulness* of their *practices*, if possibly they be not *true* also, are still as *justly* and equitably capable of the same excuse, that they are *involuntary* errors, and then by their own rule, cannot justly fall under such their *rigid censures*, which belong to none but *voluntary* offenders.

4. *Secondly*, the *indevouring* to *insnare* and *pervert fearful* or *feeble* minds, using these *terrors*, as the *Lyon* doth his *roaring*, to intimidate the *prey*, and make it not *rationally* but astonishtly, *fall* down before them. And as the offering due *grounds* of *conviction* to him that is in error may justly be deemed *charity*, so this tender of nothing but *frights*, without offer of such *grounds* of *conviction*, is but leading men into *temptation* to sin against *conscience*, to *dissimulation* &c. and so the *hating the brother in the heart*, *Lev.* 19. the more than *suffering sin* upon him.

5. To these might be, not unseasonably, added a farther consideration, which hath carried *weight* with the *Fathers* of the *Church* in all times, that seeing the *Censures* of the *Church* were left there, πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν ἀ πρὸς καθαίρεσιν, *for edification not for destruction*, and are onely designed to *charitative* ends, (must never be used to any *other* purpose) therefore when *obedience* it utterly *cast off*, the band, be it of *subordination* or *co-ordination* so broken, that the issuing out of *Censures* cannot expect to *compose*, but onely to *widen* the *breach*, not

not to *mollifie* but *exasperate*, there *Christian prudence* is to indevour by *milder* waies, what *severity* is not likely to effect, and so the *thunderbolts* to be laid up, till there may be some probability of *doing good* by them.

6. But this is not the case, as it really lies betwixt *Rome* and us, save onely as *à majori* it may be *accommodated* to us; we have cast off neither *obedience* to any, to whom it was *due*, nor *charity* to those, who have least to us, nor *truth*, to the utmost of our *understandings*, and yet we must be cast out and *anathematized*, and after all that, *condemned* as *wilful schismaticks*, i. e. αὐτοκατάκριτοι, *dividers* and *condemners* of *our selves*, because we quietly *submit* to that *fate*, which will cost us too dear, the *wounding* and *disquiet* of our *conscience*, to qualifie our selves for a *capacity* of getting out of it.

7. What he adds of their *highest tribunal*, the *Churches voice*, which hath passed this *judgment* against us, belongs I suppose to those *Bishops* of *Rome*, which have sent out their *Bulls* against us, and therefore I must in reason adde, that those are principally guilty of this *schisme*, and so their *successors* principally obliged to *retract* and *reform* the *sin* of it, and after them, all others in the *order* and *measure*, that they have partaked in this *guilt* with them.

8. And there can be no greater *charity* than to beseech all in the *bowels* of *Christ* to return to the *practice* of that *charity*, which hath too long been exiled from among *Christian* Professors.

CHAP.

Chap. XI.
An Anſwer to the Exceptions made to the laſt Chapter.

Sect. I.

Of the preſent ſtate of the Church of England. *The Catholicks promiſe for eternity to his Church.* Roma æterna. *Particular Churches periſhable. Mr.* Hooker's *prediction of the Church The power of the ſecular Magiſtrate to remove Biſhops Sees, not to make Biſhops. The Councel of* Florence *concerning the Popes ſupremacy &c.* Marcus's *opinion of it.* Joſeph: Methonenſ: *his anſwer briefly examined.*

Num. 1. THE laſt part of this *Gentleman's* indevour is to perſwade men that the *Church* of *England* is not onely *perſecuted* but *deſtroyed*, and of that he means to make his advantage to fetch in *Proſelytes*, being out of his great *charity* very ſenſible of their *eſtate*, unwilling they ſhould ſit any longer in the *vault* or *charnel houſe* to communicate with *ſhades*, when they are invited to a fairer *ſunſhine*, in a *vital* and very *flouriſhing ſociety*. Thus then he begins his reply to the 11*th Chapter*,

2. *In the laſt Chapter he complaineth of the Catholicks for reproaching them with the loſſe of their Church, and arguing with their diſciples in this ſort; Communion in ſome Church, even externally, is neceſſary, but you cannot now communicate with your late Church, for that hath no ſubſiſtence, therefore you ought to return to the Church from whence you went out; truly in this caſe I think they ought to pardon the Catholick who hath, or undoubtedly is perſwaded he hath a promiſe for eternity to his Church, and experience in the execution of that promiſe for* 16 *Ages, in which none other can compare with him, and ſees another Church judged by one of the learneſt and moſt prudent perſons*

Hooker's *Eccl: Pol:*

perſons confeſſedly that ever was among them, to be a building likely to laſt but 80 *years, and to be now torn up by the roots, and this done by the ſame means by which it was ſetled; I ſay if this Catholick believe his eyes, he is at leaſt to be excuſed; and though I know the Doctor will reply his Church is ſtill in being, preſerved in Biſhops and Preſbyters rightly ordained, yet let him remember how inconſequent this is, to what he hath ſaid before, for ask him how it doth remain in being, if there be no ſuch Biſhops or Preſbyters among them, for his defenſe againſt the Church of* Rome *is, that the ſecular authority hath power to make and change Biſhops and Presbyters: from whence it will follow, that as they were ſet up by a ſecular authority, ſo are they pulled down, and unbiſhoped by another ſecular authority; if it be ſaid the Parliament that pulled them down had not the three bodies requiſite to make a Parliament, no more had that which ſet them up, for the Lords Spiritual were wanting both in Parliament and Convocation, ſo that there was as much authority to pull them down as to ſet them up: but it will be replied that though they are pulled down, yet are they ſtill Biſhops,* viz: *the character remains upon them.*

Alas what is their Character, if their miſſion of Preaching and Teaching be extinguiſhed, which follows their juriſdiction, which juriſdiction the Doctor makes ſubject to the ſecular authority, ſo that whatſoever characters their Biſhops and Preſbyters pretend to have, they have according to his principles no power over the laity, and ſo no character can be made of any Biſhop as head and Paſtor, and of the People as body and flock, and conſequently their Church is gone.

But we account our ſelves Biſhops and Prieſts not from an authority dependent upon Princes, or inherited from Auguſtus *or* Nero, *but from* Peter *and* Paul, *and ſo ſhall ſtand and continue, whatſoever Princes or ſecular powers decree; when they according to their doctrines and arguments are not to wonder if they be thrown down by the ſame authority that ſet them up, and as the Synagogue was a Church to have an end, ſo is this with this difference, that the Synagogue was a true Church in reference to a better, but this is a counterfeit & tyranical one to puniſh a better.*

As concerning the Doctors prayer for Peace and Communion, all good people will joyne with him, if he produce Fructus dignos pœnitentiæ, *especially if he acknowledge the infallibility of the Church, and supremacy of the Pope, the former is explicated sufficiently in divers Books, the latter is expressed in the Councel of* Florence *in these words,* viz. *we define that the Holy Apostolical See, and the Bishop of Rome have the primacy over all the world, and that the Bishop of Rome is successor to S.* Peter, *the Prince of the Apostles, and truly Christs Vicar, and head of the whole Church, and the Father and Teacher of all Christians, and that there was given him in Saint* Peter *from Christ a full power to feed, direct and governe the Catholike Church: So farre the Councel. Without obeying this, the Doctor is a Schismatick, and without confessing the other, an Heretick, but let him joyne with us in these, all the rest will follow.*

3. I shall not here repeat my *complaint* (if it were indeed such, and not rather a bare *proposing* of a last foreseen *objection* against us) knowing how little *compassion* any *sufferings* of ours may expect to receive from this *Gentleman*, I shall onely joyne issue with his tenders of *proof*, that our *Church* hath now no *subsistence*; but yet before I doe so, take notice of one part of his *arguing*, viz. that the *Catholike hath, or is undoubtedly perswaded he hath a promise for eternity to his Church.* Where certainly the *fallacie* is very visible, and sufficient to supersede (if he shall *advert* to it) his undoubted *perswasion.* For what *promise* of *eternity* can this *Gentleman* here reflect on? undoubtedly that of the *Church* of *Christ* indefinitely, that the *Gates of Hell shall not prevaile against it*, *Mat.* 16. 18.

4. What is the full importance of that *phrase* is * elsewhere largely shewed, and need not be here any farther *repeated*, than that the *promise infallibly* belongs not to any *particular Church*, of any one *denomination*, but to the whole *body*, *Christ* will preserve to himselfe a *Church* in this *world*, as long as this *world* lasteth, in despight of all the *malice*, *cunning*, or *force* of *men*, and *devills*.

* *Annot. on the place.*

5. Now that this is no *security*, or promise of *eternity* to any *particular Church*, whether of *Rome* or *England*, any more than

than of *Thyatira* or *Laodicea* (which contrary to any ſuch *promiſe*, is threatned to be *Spued* out, *Rev.*3.16.) is in it ſelf moſt evident, becauſe the deſtroying any *one* particular *Church* is reconcileable with *Chriſts* preſerving ſome other, as the *Species* of mankinde is preſerved, though the *Gentleman* and I ſhould be ſuppoſed to *periſh*, and becauſe the Ἐκκλησία μοῦ, *my Church*, which is there the *ſubject* of the *diſcourſe*, is not the *Romaniſt* (or in that ſenſe the *Catholike*) his *Church*, as is here ſuggeſted, but the *Church* of *Chriſt* built upon the *foundation* of the *Apoſtles*, of which *Simon* is there ſaid to be one Πέτρος, i.e *ſtone* or *foundation-ſtone*, ſo as he was of other *Churches*, beſide that of *Rome*, and ſo as others were of other *Churches*, which he never came neere, and even of this of *Rome*, Saint *Paul* as well as he.

6. From hence therefore, by force of this *promiſe* (which as truly belongs to every *Church*, as it doth to *Rome*, but indeed belongs to no *particular*, but to the *Chriſtian Church*, to conclude that the *Church* of *Rome* is *eternall*, is a firſt ungrounded *perſwaſion* in this *Gentleman*, the very ſame, as to conclude a *particular* is an *univerſal*, or that the *deſtruction* of one *part* is the utter *diſſolution* of the *whole*; and the proof from *experience* of 16. *ages*, which is here added, is a ſtrange way of *argumentation*, ſuch as that *Methuſalem* might have uſed the very day *before* his death, to prove that he ſhould *never dye*, and the very ſame that *Heathen Rome* did uſe, at the time of their *approaching* deſtruction, calling her ſelfe * *Urbem æternam*, the *eternall City*, and † ἠρανόπολιν Ῥωμὴν, *Rome the Heaven-City*, and * Ῥωμὴν θεὰν, *Rome a Goddeſſe*, which accordingly had by *Adrian* a Temple erected to it, and the *Emperors* thereof, and the very *name* of the place *worſhipt* as a *deity* (*More Deæ, nomenque loci ſeu numen adorant*) and all this upon this one *ſcore*, that it had *ſtood* and *proſpered* ſo long.

* *Hieron. qu.* 11. *ad Algas.*
† *Athenæus*, l. 1.
* *Golizius in Theſaur. Dio in Adriano Prudentius.*

7. The like may be affirmed of the *Church* of the *Jewes*, built upon a *promiſe*, which had more of *peculiarity* to the *ſeed* of *Abraham*, than this of *Mat.*16. can be imagined to have to the *Church* of *Rome*, and yet that *Church* was de-

ſtroyed, and nothing more contributed to the *provocation*, and merit of that *deſtruction*, than their owne *confidence* of being *unperiſhable*. The beſt admonition in this reſpect, is that of the *Apoſtle*, *Be ye not high minded but feare*, and *If God ſpared not the Natural branches, take heed alſo leſt he ſpare not you*; and this *Gentleman* cannot be ignorant what
* *Rom.* 11. 2. * *Church* it was, that was then capable of this *exhortation*. And the very making this matter of *argument*, and in this reſpect (not of *purity*, but of *duration*) exalting the *Romaniſt's Church*, above all other *Churches* in theſe words [*none other can compare with him*,] as it is one character which determines the ſpeech to the *particular Church* of *Rome*, (for elſe how can he ſpeak of *others* and affirme that they *cannot compare*) ſo it is no very *humble*, or conſequently *Chriſtian* expreſſion in this *Gentleman*.

8. What he addes out of Maſter *Hooker*, and applies as the *judgement* of that *learned* man concerning the *Church* of *England*, yeilds us theſe farther obſervations, 1. That in all reaſon this *Gentleman* muſt in his former words ſpeak of his *Church* of *Rome*, as that is a *particular Church*, for elſe how can he after his *Church*, name *another Church*, meaning this of *England*, of which ſaith he, Mr. *Hooker* ſpeaks? and that will conclude the evident *falſity* of his *aſſumption*, that by *Chriſt's promiſe eternity* belonged to it, for that it cannot doe to any *particular Church*, becauſe the *Univerſal* may be preſerved, when that is deſtroyed, and the *promiſe* being made indefinitely to the *Church*, may be performed in any *part* of it.

9. *Secondly*, That a very ſmall matter will ſerve turne with this *Gentleman*, to ſupport a *concluſion*, which he hath a mind to inferre, otherwiſe Maſter *Hookers Teſtimony* had never been produced to this matter. The words of that (truly) moſt *learned* and *prudent* perſon, are to be found in his *fifth Book*, *Num.* 79. in the *Concluſion*. The *ſubject* of that whole *Paragraph*, beginning *pag.* 424. is of *Oblations*, *Foundations*, *Endowments*, *Tithes*, all intended for the *perpetuity* of *Religion*, which was in his opinion ſure to be *fruſtrated*, by *alienation* of *Church livings*, and this being largely handled

by

by him throughout that *Paragraph*, at length he obſerves, 1. what waſte *Covetouſneſſe* had made in the *Church* by ſuch *commutations*, as were proportionable to *Glaucus's change*, giving the *Church flanel* for *Gold*: and 2. how *Religion* it ſelf was made a *Sollicitor* and perſwader of *Sacrilege*, ſignifying, that to *give to God*, is *error*, and to take it away againe *Reformation of error*, concluding in theſe words, *By theſe or the like ſuggeſtions received with all joy, and with like ſedulity practiſed in certain parts of the Chriſtian world, they have brought to paſſe, that as David doth ſay of Man, ſo it is in danger to be verified concerning the whole Religion and ſervice of God, the time thereof may peradventure fall out to be threeſcore and ten yeers, or if ſtrength doe ſerve unto foureſcore, what followeth, is likely to be ſmall joy for them, Whoſoever they be that behold it. Thus have the beſt things been overthrowne, not ſo much by puiſſance and might of adverſaries, as through defect of Councel in them that ſhould have upheld and defended the ſame.*

10. This is the firſt importance of that place which the *Gentleman* hath ſo diſguiſed in his *abbreviation*. *Mr. Hooker* foretells what a deſtructive *influence*, *Sacrilege* may have on the *whole Religion* and *Service* of *God*, obſerves in *certain parts* of the *Chriſtian world* (without naming any) that *ſacrilegious ſuggeſtions* are *received with all joy*, and putting theſe two together, *preſageth ſad* events to the *whole Religion*, and *ſervice* of *God*, within *threeſcore* and *ten*, or *foureſcore* yeares, and from hence this *Gentleman* concludes it Maſter *Hooker's judgement*, that the *Church* of *England* was a *building likely to laſt but foureſcore yeares.*

11. In what *mode* and *figure* this *concluſion* is thus made from the *premiſſes*, he leaves us to divine, who have not *ſagacity* enough to diſcern it; The *concluſion* to all mens underſtanding will moſt regularly follow thus, that the *Church* of *England* was ſo *conſtituted*, that all the *enemies* thereof on either ſide were never likely to *deſtroy* it by *arguments*, and *conſequently* that the moſt probable way remaining to *Satan* to accompliſh his *deſigne* was, by *ſacrilegious violations* to *impoveriſh* and ſubdue the maintainers of it, which as he foreſaw very likely to come to paſſe within the *age* of a *man*, ſo it

would be no *joyfull sight* when it should come, he was not so *unkinde* to any part of the *Church* of *God*, as to be willing to *live* to see it.

12. And if this *Gentleman's inclinations* have qualified him for the *receiving pleasure* or *joy* in such a *spectacle*, I shall as little envy him the *prosperity* which hath thus *petrified* his *bowels*, as he shall think fit to envy me the *honour* of being a *member* of the *purest* (being withall the most *persecuted*) *Church*.

13. *Thirdly*, That these words of Mr. *Hooker* thus pitifully distorted are the onely proof he hath for his *assertion*, that this *Church* of ours hath now no *subsistence*, and that it is now torn up by the *roots*, A way of arguing very conformable to his *characters* of a true *Church*, of which *external glory* and prosperity must never misse to be one, but very unlike the *image* of *Christ* the *head*, to which his *Church* the *body* may be allowed to hold some *proportion* of *conformity*, for of him we can give no *livelier pourtraiture*, than as we finde him *crucified* between *two thieves*, whilst the *souldiers* divide his *garments*, though they were not *over-sumptuous*, and *cast lots* who shall have his *vesture*.

14. What next follows is an answer to a supposed *objection* of ours (and that is a farther evidence of what I said, that Mr. *Hooker's distorted* speech is the onely proof of his *proposition*) The *objection* is, that our *Church is still in being preserved in Bishops and Presbyters rightly ordained*; and to this *objection* he will make some *answer* from our own *principles*, of which he supposeth this to be one, *that the secular authority hath power to make and change Bishops and Presbyters*, and saith without any regrets, that this is my *defence against the Bishop of* Rome.

15. Many replies might be made to take off all appearance of force from this *answer*. As 1. that this, to which the *answer* is accommodated, is not my *objection*. The truth is, I took not on me the *objectors* part in that place, but evidenced it by clear *demonstration*, that if *twenty years* agoe the *Church* of *England* was a *Church*, it must needs be so now, being the very same that then it was, *except these bands*, as the *Apostle* once said, who I hope did not cease to be an *Apostle* by being

ing

ing *impriſoned*. And when I mentioned the *Church* of *Englands* being *preſerved* in *Biſhops* and *Preſbyters rightly ordained*, together with *multitudes* rightly *baptized* (which ſure are all the neceſſary *ingredients* in *conſtituting* a *viſible Church*) I added, *none of which have fallen off from their profeſſion*, and then foreſeeing the onely poſſible *objection* to inferre the *Church* guilty of *ſchiſme*, I anſwered that by remembring the *Primitive perſecutions* and *night-meetings*, and the very manner of the *Romaniſts* ſerving *God* in this *Kingdome* for theſe many years.

16. And all this is pulled off from the *clue*, and *fumbled* together into an *objection* of mine, ſuppoſed to be made againſt that which the *Romaniſt*, without either tender of *proof*, or *reaſon*, had crudely affirmed. But truly I may be believed, that I meant not that *affirmation* ſo much reſpect, as to offer *objection* againſt it: And then that is one ſpeedy way of *concluding* this matter.

17. But then *ſecondly*, for that ſaying of mine, on which he will form his *anſwer* to this imaginary *objection*, 'tis certain I never ſaid any ſuch thing, as is here ſuggeſted: That the *ſupreme Magiſtrate* hath *power* to *erect* and *tranſlate Patriarchates*, and the like, I had *affirmed* indeed, *i. e.* to make that a *Patriarchal See*, which had not formerly been ſuch, ſo to ennoble a *town* or *city*, that according to the *Canons* of the *Church* it ſhould become an *Epiſcopal*, or *Archiepiſcopal*, or *Chief*, or *Patriarchal See*, and my meaning is evident, and not poſſible to be miſtaken by any that underſtands the *Language*, and adverts to what he reads.

18. But ſure I never ſaid that the *ſecular authority hath power to make Biſhops and Preſbyters*, and there is no *queſtion* but this *Gentleman* knows, if he hath read what he *anſwers*, that in the *Tract* of *Schiſme* I never ſaid it.

19. So again it is of daily *practice* in this *Church*, as in all others, for the *ſupreme power* to *change*, as that *ſignifies* to *remove Biſhops* from one *See* to another, and ſo for every *lay-Patron* in the ſame ſenſe to *change Preſbyters*: But what is that to the *making* of *Biſhops* or *Preſbyters*, did ever *King* or *lay-Patron* pretend to that? This is too viſible to need inſiſting on.

Thirdly,

20. *Thirdly*, when he saith there *was as much authority to pull down Bishops* and *Presbyters* in this *nation as to set them up*, I might demand, 1. Whether he hath any reason to pretend that *Presbyters* are now *pulled down* in this *nation*, for this is by him supposed, who inquires by what *authority* they are *pulled down*: 2. Whether he can, either upon mine or his own principles, assume with any colour of truth, that none had any hand in *setting up* the *Bishops* in this *Kingdome*, but those whom here he affirms to have consented to the *pulling* them *down*, and consequently affirm, that there was as much *authority* to *pull* them *down*, as to *set* them up? 3. Whether it have any truth in it, (whether he speak of what was done in *Parliament* in *King Henry*'s, or *King Edward*'s, or *Queen Elizabeth*'s daies) that the *Lords Spiritual were wanting both in Parliament and Convocation*? 4. What he hath said to make it in the least degree *probable*, that the *Bishops* and *Presbyters mission* of *preaching* and *teaching* is *extinguished* among us, any more than it was in the *Primitive Church*, when the *Emperour* was not *favourable* to the *profession*, and when the *Jewes* called it *heresie*: And *lastly*, whether, if no one of these can with any degree of *verity* be answered in the *affirmative*, this be not very immoderate liberty, which this *Gentleman* hath given himself in *affirming* or *supposing* all these, and then adding, that our *portion* is to be lookt for with the *Jewish Synagogue*, as one, so the other, to have an *end*; not considering that he hath as little skill in *revealing secrets*, as even now in *interpreting* Mr. *Hooker*'s *prophecy*, that he cannot yet tell, what *God* hath within his *veil* decreed concerning our *Church*, and which may yet make the greatest speed to follow the *Synagogue*'s *fate*, they which are *cast down*, *but not destroyed*, or they which (to say no worse) *stand* by, and *rejoice* at it.

21. The *Treatise* of *Schisme* concludes with a *Prayer* for *Peace* and *Communion*, and for the matter of it, we have his seeming *confession* that *all good people will joyne* in it. But even in such a *Prayer*, wherein *all good people will joyne*, this *Gentleman* will not *joyne* with me, but upon such *termes*, which I shall not undertake, to *qualifie* me for his *favour*, I meane not

not the *fructus dignos pœnitentiæ*, such as *John Baptist* would *prescribe*, but the *penances* of this *severer* confessor, to acknowledge the *Infallibility* of the *Church* in his notion of the *Church*, *Supremacy* of the *Pope*, &c.

22. And all that I shall need to reply is, to beseech him that he will then, without *joyning* with me, pray in *secret*, what I began to him, and endeavour so to qualifie himselfe with *charity* and other *graces*, which may *wing* his *prayers* unto that holy place, where all *humble Christians supplications* daily meet, and then I shall againe *pray God*, that I may be found in the number of *those*, that so I may be secured to *meet* and *joyne* with him, at that *common* throne of *grace*.

23. He is pleased to shut up all with an expression of the *Councel* of *Florence*, to the businesse of the *Popes supremacy*. To this I might reply that this *definition* is there visibly subscribed, as the *act* of the *Bishop* of *Rome*, *Eugenius* IV. (who was a *liberall* carver aud *definer* for himselfe) as may be seen in that very * page, where the words cited will be found, both by the *Seale* of his *Pontificate* there *imprest*, Saint *Peter* on the *left hand*, Saint *Paul* on the *right*, and *Eugenius Pp.* IV. under it; and by the last part of the *date* in these words, τῆς ἀρχιερατείας ἡμῶν ἔτει ἐννάτῳ, *in the ninth year of our Pontificate*; which though I shall suppose to be the *mode*, the *Pope* to *pronounce* the *definition* of the *Councel*, yet this was much varied from the *old* form, and the *Councel* being dated at *Florence*, in the year of our *Lord* 1439. so near *Rome*, and so farre from the *first* times, where more *simplicity* and just *distribution* of *rights* might be expected, this might be a competent *answer* to this *testimony*, and a *vindicating* my self from all *schisme* or *heresie*, that my want of the *obedience* or *confession*, which he requires, might *fix* on me.

* *Conc* p.858 *Paris:*

24. But I shall for this once, choose somewhat the *longer* way, and transcribe part of *Marcus* the *Metropolitan* of *Ephesus* his *answer*, wherein he expresseth his *opinion*, and others, of that *definition* of the *Councel*, as it lies in the * *Apologie* of *Joseph Methonensis* for that *Councel*, Καὶ ἡμεῖς τὸν Πάππαν ὡς ἕνα τῶν Πατριαρχῶν λογιζόμεθα, οὔτοι δὲ βικάριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ πατέρα καὶ διδάσκαλον τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἁπάντων μάλα σεμνῶς ἀποφαίνονται,

* *Jose thon: p cil: Fl* p.102

νονλαι, *We also account the Pope as one of the Patriarchs, But these doe with great gravity pronounce him Vicar of Christ, and Father and Teacher of all Christians:* and this both to them and us is matter of some wonder, how (μάλα σεμνῶς) with so much *gravity*, they could thus *pronounce*, what had so little of *truth* in it.

25. And it is worth recounting here, what for the *justifying* of that *definition* Ioseph *Methonensis* was able to reply there to that *Bishop* (and that *reply* thought worthy to be inserted into the *Acts* of the *Councel*) 1. That he doth not say *that the Pope is two or three, but onely one of the Patriarchs,* ἐν τῷ ὁμοταγέσι τὶς πρωτεύων, *having præeminence among those of the same Order with him.*

26. For this he hath, 1. *Chrysostome*'s authority in his 17 *Homilie* on the *Acts*, where, he saith, *that among the seven there was one,* περικεῖθ᾽ ἡ τὰ πρωτεῖα ἔχων, *one above the rest* (and the *seven* there, were the *seven Deacons*, and the same *præeminence* that *Stephen* then had over them, and all the *rest* of the *world*, we shall not deny the *Bishop* of *Rome*, especially if, as it follows there, he have the πλείονα χάριν *more grace* than all the *other Bishops*, and will acknowledge, as it is there also, the χειροτονίαν κοινὴν, the *same ordination* of him and all other *Bishops*.)

27. *Secondly*, the saying of *Christ*, that, *He that heareth you, heareth me*, and the common *maxime* πάντα ἀρχιερέα διάδοχον Χριστοῦ εἶναι, *that every Bishop is the successor of Christ* (But then how came the *Bishop* of *Rome* to impropriate that *title*, to be the *onely* one that all are obliged to *hear*, when, as he confesses there, ἡ ταῦτα μὲν κοινῶς πρὸς πάντας, *This was said in common to them all.*)

28. *Thirdly*, the words of *Theodorus Studita* (one, by the way, that had been *imprisoned* for *opposing* the *Bishop* of *Constantinople*, and who did not *communicate* with that *Church*, see *Zonaras tom:* 3. p. 9. & 102.) to the *Emperor Michael*, that if he *doubted* of, or *disbelieved* any thing that had been there *resolved*, he should command a διασάφησις *declaration* or *explication* to be sent him from *old Rome*, ὡς ἄνωθεν ἡ ἐξ ἀρχῆς παραπεμφθέντος ἐξεδόθη, *how from of old, and from the* 31

beginning

beginning it had been delivered by tradition of Fathers, adding that that was κορυφαιοτάτη τῆς ἐκκλησιῶν *the uppermoſt of the Churches* of *God*, of which *Peter* was πρωτόθρονος, the *firſt* that *ſate Biſhop* there, unto whom *Chriſt* ſaid, *Thou art Peter, &c.* (But all this ſtill amounts to no more, but that *Rome* was the *prime Apoſtolick See*, that might very probably *explicate* a difficulty to the *Emperour*, by telling what had been from time to time *delivered*, and *believed* in that *Church.*)

29. *Fourthly*, the words of the ſame *Theodorus Studita* again, in his *Epiſtle* to *Naucratius*, which ſpeaks of ſome that had *broken off themſelves from the body of Chriſt*, from the *chief See*, in which *Chriſt* placed the *Keyes* of that *faith*, againſt which the *gates of hell*, the *mouthes* of *hereticks* had not, ſhould not *prevail*, (But then ſtill, ſuppoſing his *teſtimonie* were *authentick*, this is no more, but that, they which divided from the true *doctrine*, which he ſuppoſed to be at *Rome*, did in his opinion *break* off themſelves from the *body* of *Chriſt*, that *Rome* again was the *prime See*, that it had the *Keyes* of *knowledge* and *faith* intruſted to it by *Chriſt*, at the *Apoſtles founding* a *Church* there, but this not *excluſively* to other *Churches*, which doubtleſſe had thoſe *Keyes*, as well as ſhe, & that the *faith* of *Chriſt* ſhould never be utterly deſtroyed by *hereticks.*)

30. *Fifthly*, the words of *Arcadius* a *Biſhop* in the *third Councel*, that of *Epheſus*, propoſing that the words of *Cœleſtine* the *Pope*, who was to be *named with all reverence*, *Biſhop* of the *Apoſtolicall See*, ſhould be read, that they might ſee *what care he had of all Churches* (and why might not the like be ſaid of any other *truly Chriſtian Biſhop?*) And ſo the like ſpeech again of *Cyrill* of *Alexandria*, that the *letter* of *Cœleſtine*, the *moſt holy Biſhop* of the *holy Apoſtolick Church* (a title which belonged, and was ordinarily given to *other Sees*, beſide that of *Rome*) μὲτῆς πρεσφόρου τιμῆς ἀναγινωσκέσθω *might be read with due honour* or *reſpect* (but ſure that doth not prove his *ſupreme power* over all the *Churches* of *God.*)

31. *Laſtly*, the words of the *Emperor's letter* (called θεῖον γράμμα *a divine letter*) in the *Councel* of *Chalcedon*, that the *moſt*

bleſſed Biſhop of the city of Rome, to whom *antiquity* hath given ἱερωσύνῃ καὶ πάντων, *prieſthood over all*, χωρὰν καὶ ὑποθεσίαν ἔχειν περὶ πίστεως καὶ ἱερέων ἀνακρίνειν, *may have a place and power to judge of faith and of Prieſts*, from whence he roundly concludes, Ἐπεὶ οὖν περὶ πίστεως, &c. *Seeing then he hath power to judge of Faith and Prieſts, he is juſtly defined by the Councel of Florence* διδάσκαλον καὶ τῶν χριστιανῶν ἁπάντων, *the teacher of all Chriſtians.*

32. This being the *laſt* and moſt *probable*, and indeed *only Teſtimonie*, to *juſtifie* with any *colour* or *reaſon* the *definition* of that *Councel*, it is not amiſſe to conſider it a *little*, and with that to conclude alſo the *debate* with this *Gentleman*, as *Joſeph Methonenſis* there did with the *Biſhop* of *Epheſus*. And if we turn to the *Acts* of the *Councel* of *Chalcedon*, we ſhall ſoon diſcern the full *weight* of it.

33. There in the * firſt part, *num:* 25. we ſhall finde this Letter, ſtyled θεῖον γράμμα, ſent by *Valentinian* the *Emperour* to *Theodoſius*, ὅσε κελεύσαι ἐν τοῖς μέρεσι τῆς Ἰταλίας σύνοδον ἐπιτελεσθῆναι, *that he would command a Synod to be called in the parts of* Italy. This then was the *ſubject* of the Letter, and this the *occaſion*; A *ſecond Synod* had lately been held at *Epheſus*, in which the *hereſie* of *Eutyches* had received ſome *aſſiſtance*, Upon this *Pope Leo*, and his *Synod* of *Biſhops* met at *Rome*, * writes earneſtly to the *Emperor Valentinian*, that he will κελεύειν *command* γενικὴν σύνοδον *a General Councel to be called in the parts of* Italy, that may *remove* and *mollifie* all *offences*. The ſame he * again propoſes to the *Emperour Theodoſius* there, deſiring, ἰδικὴν σύνοδον a *ſpecial Councel* to be convened in the parts of *Italy*. Hereupon ſoon follows a *letter* of *Valentinian* to *Theodoſius* to the ſame purpoſe, in condeſcenſion to *Leo*'s requeſt, and in it thoſe very words (recited by *Joſeph Methonenſis* in defence of the *Councel* of *Florence*) to no other ſenſe but this, that ſuch a *Councel* might be *convened in Italy*, to *review* and *reform* what had been done amiſſe in that *ſecond Councel* of *Epheſus*.

* *Concil: tom:* 3. p. 25.

* *Ibid:* n. 19. p. 19.

* *Ibid:* n. 20. p. 20.

34. This therefore is the meaning of the ἵνα χωρὰν καὶ ὑποθεσίαν ἔχῃ, *that he may have a place and power*] that ſome *place* may be aſſigned him and the *Biſhops*, to meet in *Councel*, that he may

may have *power*, or *faculty*, or *Commiſſion* to ſit (not he by himſelf, but he and the *Biſhops* in *Councel*) and when they ſit, περὶ τε πίστεως καὶ ἱερέων κείνῳ, *to judge of faith and Prieſts*, as in all *Councels* it is done, to *define* what is the *true faith*, oppoſed by *hereticks*, and what *perſons*, *Biſhops* or others are fit to be *cenſured* for any thing done or taught by them.

35. This is the plain and onely importance of the place, to which all the reſt of the *Epiſtle* accords, that an *Univerſal Councel* ſhould be called in *Italy*, wherein the *Pope* was doubtleſſe to *preſide*, and he σωαχθέντων ἐκ πάσης οἰκουμένης καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἱερέων, *all other Biſhops alſo being convened from the whole world*, ſhould conſider and *define*, what the *true faith* required. And ſo this is a faire *teſtimonie* to prove that the *Pope* is the *Vicar* of *Chriſt*, the *Father* and *teacher* of all *Chriſtians*.

The Concluſion.

Num. 1. I Am now come to the *cloſe* of this *Gentleman's Anſwer* in theſe words,

Thus, Sir, you have my ſenſe of Doctor Hammond's *Book in all the particulars, which, I think, to the purpoſe; my time, nor the brevity fit for a Letter, not permitting I ſhould be more methodical, and doe reſt*

Bruxels,
the 30 *March,*
1654.

Your friend
and humble ſervant,

B. P.

2. Here he is pleaſed largely enough to aſſume the office of an *Ariſtarchus*, and to involve under no light *cenſure*, of *impertinency* at the leaſt, the farre greateſt part of that *Treatiſe* of *Schiſme*, for certainly that which he hath not offered any *Anſwer* to, is ſuch, and yet he here undertakes to have given his *ſenſe in all the particulars, which he thinks to the purpoſe*, which muſt conclude it his *opinion*, that all other *particulars* are not to the *purpoſe*. This indeed is a *performance* ſomewhat above the *promiſe* of the *title page*, which obliged him to an *Anſwer of the moſt material parts* of that *Treatiſe*; And it were very eaſie to ſhew that there is no degree of truth in either of theſe, that on the contrary, he hath not offered any word of *Reply* to the moſt *material*, which I hope are not the *leaſt pertinent* parts of that *Treatiſe*. But inſtead of this larger *Reflexion* it may ſuffice, that whatſoever he hath thought

thought fit to take *notice* of, and thereby hath expreſſed his *judgment* of it, that it is *moſt material* in *compariſon* of the reſt hath here been very *particularly* conſidered, and his *Anſwers* manifeſted to have no *force* in them. And ſo I very friendly take my leave of him.

The God of all grace and peace binde up the wounds of his bleeding Church.

An Account of H.T. *his* APPENDIX TO His MANUAL of CONTROVERSIES, CONCERNING *The Abbot of* Bangor's *Anſwer to* Auguſtine.

1. HAving concluded the foregoing *Reply* to the *Catholick Gentleman*, I received news of a *Manual* of *Controverſies* in the preſſe, wherein I was ſaid to be particularly concerned, and having ſoon gotten a ſight of it, I found that the matter was of no greater *bulk* or *weight*, than might receive an *account* in few words, & thoſe moſt proper to be here *annext*, by way of *Appendix*.

2. At the folding up of that *Manual*, the *Author* of it is pleaſed to take notice of (no more than) *one teſtimonie*, which I had cited out of Sir *Henry Spelman's Anglicane Councels*, containing an *Anſwer* of the *Abbot* of *Bangor* to *Auguſtine* the *Monk*, when he demanded of the *Britains* an acknowledgment of *ſubmiſſion* to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*.

3. The paſſage is to be ſeen at large, in *Welſh*, *Engliſh*, and *Latine*, in that *tome* of the *Councels*, p. 108. and is recited in the *Treatiſe* of *Schiſme*, p. 111. and the ſumme of it is, that he and the reſt of the *Britiſh Church* were under the *government* of the *Archbiſhop* of *Caerleon* upon *Uske*, and owed no *obedience* (or reſpect, ſave that of *fraternal charity*) to the *Pope* of *Rome*.

4. This *Anſwer* of that *Abbot*, the *Authour* hath thought good to *cenſure* (by way of *Appendix* to the *Article* concerning the *Pope's Supremacy*) 1. As *unapt* to conclude againſt the *Romaniſt's* pretenſions concerning *the Papal power over the whole Church*. 2. As *unworthily alledged by perſons of any ordinary judgement or erudition*. 3. As that which may eaſily be *convicted to be a ſimple impoſture*, and the waies of *demonſtrating* it *clearly*, promiſed in that inſuing *diſcourſe*.

5. What thoſe waies are, and how farre ſhort of the *force* or *evidence* of *demonſtration*, I ſhall, with the *Reader's* good leave, examine anon, after I have premiſed this one *conſideration*, That the onely thing, which is by us conteſted, and concluded againſt the *Romaniſt* from this *teſtimonie*, is a matter of *fact* of *known* truth, and ſuch as the *Romaniſts* themſelves (yea and this *Authour H. T.* who hath thought fit to arraign this *teſtimonie*) acknowledge to be ſuch, and therefore, as in caſe this *one teſtimonie* ſhould be *demonſtrated* to be a *ſimple impoſture*, we can very *unconcernedly* and eaſily part with it, ſtanding in no manner of need of this *auxiliarie*, ſo it is a little ſtrange that this *Authour* ſhould think it worth his *ſolemn pains*, to wreſt it out of our hands, and dedicate this whole *Appendix* to that *one* work, when if he were *ſucceſsfull* to his wiſh; his *acquiſitions* hereby, and proportionably our *loſſes*, muſt be ſo *unconſiderable*.

6. That which we conclude from hence againſt the *Romaniſt* is no more but this, that the *Britains*, particularly thoſe of *Bangor*, denied to yeild *obedience* to the *Pope* upon *Auguſtine's* demand of it. And for this we have the *notoriouſneſs* of the *fact*, as it is ſet down by the *Authours* which are of *credit*, and are vouched in this matter by the *Romaniſt*, particularly by *Bede*, in the ſecond Book of his *Eccleſiaſtick Hiſtorie*, c. 2. where the whole ſtory may be read at large, and out of which I ſhall collect, and, in paſſing, clear theſe few things.

7. *Firſt*, that *Auguſtine* and the *Britiſh Biſhops* met in *Councel* at *Auguſtine's Oake* in *Worceſterſhire*; This paſſage lyes very corruptly in the *Latine Bede*, *in loco ubi uſque hodie linguâ Anglorum Augiſtineſzat, id eſt, robur Auguſtini in confinio*

confinio Vectiorum & Occidentalium Saxonum appellatur. Three *corruptions* I suppose there will soon appear to be in these words, which I shall briefly remove for the clearing of our entrance, and disabusing the *Authour* of this *Manual* in one of them.

8. The *first*, and chief of them is, that *Augustineizat* is a σφάλμα γραφικὸν, mistaken for *Augustines-ac*, i.e. *Augustines oake*, whether that were the name of a *Tree*, or a *Village*, most probably the former, after the manner of that *Councel*, which was held against S. *Chrysostome*, called ordinarily the *Synod ad quercum*, *at*, or *under the Oake*.

9. *Secondly*, that [*ubi*] should be read [*qui*] which is an easie mistake, and so the *construction* will be *facile*, which now is *rough, in loco qui usque hodie- Augustines-ac appellatur, in the place which even to this day is called Augustine's-ac*, and accordingly the *Saxon* reads on þæſe ſtope þe mon nemneð Aguſtinuſ ac, *in the place still named Augustine's Oake.*

10. *Thirdly*, that *Vectiorum* (which the *Author* of this *Appendix* renders *Vectians*, and interprets to be the *Isle* of *Wight*, quite against all probable *conjecture*, for how can it be believ'd that the *Britains* should give him a meeting so farre from the place of their own present habitation?) should be *Wicciorum* (so **Huntington* reads it, and the *Saxon Bede* Hpicna) meaning *Worcestershire* by that style, and accordingly this *Synod* is by *Authors* oft called *Wigorniensis Synodus*, the *Worcestershire Synod*; and among the *British Bishops*, who are recorded to be present at the *second Session*, *Wiccensis*, the *Bishop* of *Worcester* is one. In what part of that County it was that that *Synod* convened, I see it is uncertain among our later *Writers*, and so there may be place for *conjecture*, Sir *Henry Spelman* from the *Map* proposeth *Austric*, as a probable contraction from *Austinsric*, *Augustini ditio*, as that which *may give some light in a doubtfull matter*, but upon inquiry I hear that that *village* is called *Aufric* or *Alfric*, not *Austric*, and therefore I shall take confidence to mention, what seems to me farre more probable, that it was in the *parish* of *Merton*, which hath the *agnomen* of *Ussentree*, or

* l. 3. p. 325.

or *Oſſentree*, in old *rolls*, *Merton juxta Oſſentree*, *Merton cloſe by Oſſentree*, an eaſie variation from, and contraction of *Auſtin tree*, and is three miles from *Worceſter*, neer the rode to *Droitwich*, where the *hill-Church* is *Auguſtine's Church*.

11. *Secondly*, that the buſineſſe of this *convention*, deſigned to draw the *Britiſh* to *obedience* to *Auguſtine* & the *See* of *Rome*, began with a *propoſition* onely of *conformity* in the *obſervation* of *Eaſter*, in the *Ceremonies* of *Baptiſme* &c. But this in vain; for, ſaith *Bede*, after a long *diſputation* they would give no *aſſent to the intreaties, and exhortations and chidings of* Auguſtine, *but preferred their own tradition before all the Churches through the world, which accorded with* Rome *in the particular of Eaſter, &c.*

12. *Thirdly*, that for the convincing of them, *Auguſtine* challenged them to doe *miracles*, and by *prayer* to *God* cured a *blinde* man, and was much cried up for ſo doing, the *Britiſh* ſtill *adhering* to their way, and *anſwering* him, that *abſque conſenſu & licentiâ ſuorum*, *without conſent and licence of their* whether *Rulers* of *Church*, or whatſoever other *ſuperiors* alſo (their *Metropolitan*, I ſuppoſe, which cannot be thought to have been with them at this, being certainly none of the *ſeven Biſhops*, which are affirmed to have been *preſent* at the later convention) they could not *forſake their antient cuſtomes*.

13. *Fourthly*, that upon propoſall, it was agreed that they ſhould have a ſecond meeting, at which were preſent *ſeven Britiſh Biſhops* (which other Writers expreſſe to have been the *Biſhops* of *Hereford*, *Landaff*, *Bangor*, *S. Aſſaph*, *Worceſter*, *Paternenſis*, *Morganenſis*) and many other *learned* men, eſpecially *de nobiliſſimo eorum Monaſterio, quod vocatur lingua Anglorum Bancornaburg, cui tempore illo Dinooth Abbas præfuiſſe narratur*, *of the famous Monaſterie of* Bangor, *of which* Dinooth *was Abbot at that time*.

14. *Fifthly*, that before they went to this Meeting, they were adviſed by a *religious* perſon, whoſe directions they asked, to obſerve diligently the *behaviour* of *Auguſtine*, when they came, whether he were *meek* and *lowly in heart*, a mark by which

which they might know whether he had taken *Chriſt's yoke* upon him, and conſequently whether it were the *yoke* of *Chriſt*, which he now deſired to impoſe upon them, and upon *Auguſtine's* ſitting ſtill upon his ſtool or ſeat, and never riſing up with any *civility* or *humility*, at their approach, they were ſo *diſpleaſed*, ſaith *Bede*, that they *contradicted all the propoſals that he made to them.*

15. *Sixthly*, that upon his making *three Propoſitions* to them, concerning *Eaſter*, *Baptiſme*, and *preaching to the Engliſh*, and promiſing to *bear with them in all other differences*, (of which ſort, ſaid he, there were *many wherein their practice was contrary conſuetudini noſtræ, imò Univerſalis Eccleſiæ, to the cuſtome of the Roman, yea the Univerſal Church*) they anſwered, *nihil horum ſe facturos, nec illum pro Archiepiſcopo habituros, that they would not comply with him in any of them, nor acknowledge him for their Archbiſhop*; Upon which follows that rough *ſanguinarie* anſwer of *Auguſtine's*, *quod ſi pacem cum fratribus accipere nollent, bellum ab hoſtibus forent accepturi, that if they would not accept of peace with brethren, they ſhould have warre from enemies*, and, as it follows in very plain language, *per Anglorum manus ultionem mortis eſſent paſſuri, the hands of the Engliſh ſhould act a bloody revenge upon them.*

16. Which, it ſeems, ſoon after followed, and fell in an eminent manner on the *Monks* of *Bangor*, of which order there were at that time above *two thouſand*, who *lived all by the labour of their own hands.* For, ſaith he, *King Edilfred* of *Northumberland*, coming with a great *Army* to *Caerleon*, made his firſt *onſet* on their *Prieſts*, who were *aſſembled* by themſelves *to faſt* and *pray* for their *brethren*, (as *Moſes* holding up his *hands* in *prayer*, whileſt *Joſua* held up his in *fighting*) and upon no other provocation (taken notice of by the *Hiſtorian*) but this, that they *fought againſt him with their prayers (contra nos pugnant qui adverſus nos in precationibus proſequuntur)* he firſt ſet upon them, *killed* 1200 of them, and then *deſtroyed* the *whole Army. Sicque completum eſt præſagium ſancti Pontificis Auguſtini, and ſo the preſage of the holy Biſhop* St Auguſtine *was fulfilled upon them.*

17. Theſe particulars of the *ſtory* I have thus puctually ſet down in *obedience* to the *rebuke* of this *Author*, who p. 412. chargeth it upon Sir *Hen: Spelman, and thoſe others that borrow out of him*, as a *want* of *wilingneſs to ſee the truth*, & of *fidelity* to *communicate it to others*, that they *have* choſen to *reflect on that teſtimonie* (which he is pleaſed to call *upſtart*, and) *which appeared not till within theſe* 15 *years*, and not *upon that true antiquity, which having indured the ſhock of almoſt a* 1000 *years*, Sir *Henry* had a little before *tranſcribed* out of *Bede*, *wherein*, ſaith he, *every one may read*, firſt that *miracle in giving ſight to the blinde man*, then that *divine vengeance prophetically foretold* by *Auguſtine*, which (in his opinion) *more than ſufficiently prove, that S.* Auguſtine, *ſent by the Pope, came in the name of God, from a lawfull authority, and that his demands of conformity to the Church of* Rome *in the points ſpecified were good, and to be yeilded to by the Britains.*

p. 413.

18. In this matter I might now fitly *inlarge*, and examine the force of this *two-fold argument*, that of the *miraculous cure*, and that of the *predicted vengeance*, and offer many things to conſideration concerning each head.

19. For the former, 1. the no great *credit* that hath been given to the relations of *Bede* on this head of *miracles* (of which his *Story* is ſo richly furniſhed) together with the great *deceit* that ſuch pretenſions have been *experimented* to ſubject men to: *Secondly*, the confeſſion of *Bede*, that the *Britaines* were * *unwilling to yeild* to this tryall of their cauſe, and accordingly when he ſaith that the † *blinde man being offered to the Prieſts of the Britaines, he received no cure or benefit by them*, he doth not ſo much as pretend that the *Britaines attempted* to doe the *miracle*, and failed in it, but leaves us to reſolve that they wholly *waved* this *tryall*: *Thirdly*, that if the *miracle* were granted to be a true *miracle*, and a *teſtimony* of *Gods* aſſerting the *doctrines* then *conteſted* between them, yet this would not be any concludent *teſtimonie* for the *Pope's Supremacy*, but onely for thoſe things which were then the matter of the *queſtion*, the *time* of the obſervation of *Eaſter*, the *rites* of *Baptiſme*, accuſtomed in the *Roman Church*, and at the moſt ſome ſuch like *traditions*,

* *Quod cum adverſarii, inviti licèt, concederent.*
† *Cum oblatus Britonũ ſacerdotibus nil curationis horum miniſterio cepit.*

traditions, wherein the *Britiſh* cuſtome varied from that of *Rome*, for this was the forme of the *propoſed tryall, quæ ſequenda traditio quibus ſit viis ad ingreſſum regni illius properandum, what tradition was to be followed* (in the *celebration* of *Eaſter*, that which the *Britains* had received and retained from their firſt *converſion*, imputed to an *Apoſtle* or *Apoſtolical* perſon, *Simon Zelotes* or *Joſeph* of *Arimathea*, or that which the *Romans* deduced from S. *Peter*) *by what waies they were to haſten to entrance into that Kingdome* (referring, I ſuppoſe, to the *rites* of *baptiſme*, the *ſecond* head of *debate* between them) And in both theſe, (as alſo in refuſing to joyn with *Auguſtine* in the *common* work of *preaching* to the *Gentiles*) it may eaſily be granted by us, that the *truth* was on the *Romaniſts* ſide, and not on the *Britains*, without yelding a *ſupremacie* of the *Church* of *Rome* over the *Britiſh Churches*. *Fourthly*, that the *Britains* by *Bede's* confeſſion, acknowledged themſelves *convinced* by that *miracle*, that the *way of righteouſneſs* which *Auguſtine preached*, was the *true way*, yet added, that they could not *renounce their antient cuſtomes without the conſent and licence of their own (ſuperiors)* which evidently *confines* aud *determines* the *miracle* and all the ſuppoſed *virtue* thereof to the confirming the *Traditions* which *Auguſtine delivered*, without farther extending it to the aſſerting the *Papal power* (to which the *Abbot* of *Bangor's* anſwer was particularly confronted) for had they once acknowledged themſelves *convinced* of that, there had been no place left for the *licentia ſuorum*, no need of the *conſent* or *licence* of any other ſuperiors, which yet they reſolutely adhere to. *Laſtly*, that at their *ſecond meeting* the *Britains* deemed *Auguſtine's pride* a more *valid* convincing argument, that the *yoke* which he deſigned to *impoſe* on them was not the *yoke* of *Chriſt*, than the ſuppoſed *miracle*, that it was.

20. And for the latter, that of the *ſlaughter*, firſt * *threatned* and then *fulfilled* upon them, 1. If that were indeed a *miracle*, it was not of the *complexion*, which is generally obſerved in *Chriſt's miracles*, uſed for the *working* of *faith*, but proportionable to the *Spirit* of the *Boanerges*, which would have the *fire from heaven* called down upon the *Samaritans*, and

* *Fertur minitans prædixiſſe*. Bede. *Territ eos vaticinio futuræ ſuper eos calamitatis*. Sigebert.

and were answered by *Christ* that this was not agreeable to the *Spirit* of the *Gospel*; And if the *example* of S. *Peter* on *Ananias* and *Sapphyra*, or of S. *Paul* on *Elymas* be made use of as a *precedent* for this *severity*, yet sure the answer of *Pope Gregory* to *Augustine* at that time, supposing different *Churches* to enjoy *different* customes, and not *imposing* the *Roman* upon *all*, might have directed him to greater *moderation*. See *Bed:* l. 1. c. 27. in his *answer* to the *third Interrogation*. *Secondly*, it is no very great *miracle*, that a *grand Army* falling first upon unarmed *Monks*, should obtain the *victory* against them, and afterward against all other their opposers; nor consequently is it any whit strange that *Augustine*, that was so *provoked*, and meant to use this *bloody revengefull* course, should thus *threaten* what he then *designed* to see performed, for that is the full meaning of his foretelling it.

21. It is true indeed that either *Bede*, or some *Interpolator*, that copied out the *original Latine* of that *Historie*, hath thought good to insert some words in the end of that story, l. 2. c. 2. *in fine, (quamvis ipso jam multo ante tempore ad cœlestia regna sublato)* which might delude men into a perswasion, that this *bloody* act was a *long time* after *Augustine's death*; But for this, *First*, it is observable that *King Alfred's Saxon translation* or *paraphrase* of *Bede*, wholly omits that *parenthesis*, and reads it onely thus, ⁊ ypa pæp ȝeþýlleð þe þrteðom tæp halȝan B. Aȝuſtinuſ þ hi rceoloan, &c. *and so was fulfilled the prediction of S.* Augustine, *that they should feel the revenge of temporal destruction. Secondly*, that the *series* of the *story* in *Bede* gives just *prejudice* to that *parenthesis*, for this of the *slaughter* of the *Britans* being set down in the *end* of that *second* Chap: the *third* begins with *Augustine's* ordaining two *Bishops*, *Mellitus* and *Justus*, which sure was not after his *death*, and as the *Saxon paraphrase* of *King Alfred* begins that *Chapter* with this form of reference to the *former* passage, Ðæ pæp aptep þiſſum— *It was after this*— which plainly defines *Augustine* to have *survived* that *bloody* fact, so the *Latine Bede*, which sets down the *time* of *Augustine's* ordaining those two *Bishops*, *Anno Dominicæ incarnationis sexcentesimo quarto*, *In the year* 604, doth yet more incline

us

us to ſuſpect that *Parentheſis*, for though *Bede*, who ſets down the *month* and *day* of *Auguſtine's death*, ſets not down the *year* of it, but leaves it in a latitude to be between the year 596. in which he came to *England*, and the year 613. (or, as the *Saxon* reads 616.) in which *King Ethelbert* died, yet others commonly affirm that he continued *Biſhop* 15 or 16 years, and ſo died about 612, or 13. whereas *Chronologers* affirm the *ſlaughter* of the *Monks* of *Bangor* &c. to have been in the year 603, and ſo the year immediately precedent to *Auguſtine's ordaining* thoſe two *Biſhops*. *Thirdly*, when in the relation of this *ſlaughter*, the *Latine Bede* begins *Siquidem poſthæc ipſe, de quo diximus, Rex Anglorum*— *For after this*, i. e. after *Auguſtine's threatning* deſtruction to the *Britiſh*, the *forenamed King of the Angles gathered an Army*— the *Saxon paraphraſe* reads, and ſona hpaþe æfter ðyſſum, *and ſoon rath*, i. e. *very ſoon after this*, which again perſwades that it was before *Auguſtine's* death, at leaſt that the *jam multo ante* in the *Parentheſis* (that *Auguſtine* died *long before*) could have no *truth* in it. *Laſtly*, as ſome Writers of theſe dark times have made a ſhift to affirm with the *Latine Bede* that *Auguſtine* was firſt dead, ſo it is known alſo that others charge it on him, that he was not onely the *inciter* to it, but that he *met* the *Kings* when they were ready for the *fight*, and was preſent with them; And *Trivet* in his *French Chronicle*, that ſaith it was done after *Auguſtine's* death, yet adds that *Ethelbert King* of *Kent*, who ſtirred up *Ethelfred King* of *Northumberland* and his *Saxons* againſt the *Britans*, and by name againſt *Dinoth Abbot* of *Bangor* forementioned, was *highly diſpleaſed* and *inflamed*, that he had *deſpiſed Auguſtine*. All which being conſidered, it is certain, that this was no very *Chriſtian* action, whether in *Auguſtine* or in *Ethelbert*, and the *threats* of the one, and *performances* of the other, as they bear an exact proportion, ſo are they equally *argumentative*, not *for*, but *againſt* that cauſe, which was willing thus *unchriſtianly* to ſupport it ſelf.

22. *Thirdly*, if the *ſlaughter* of theſe poor *Monks* ſhall yet be thought a ſolid *probation*, as an act of *divine vengeance* upon

them (juſt ſuch as the *falling* of the *towre* of *Siloe* was, from which none but a *Jew*, or *Turke*, or the *Barbarians*, *Act.*28. or thoſe that make *proſperity* the ſpeciall mark of the *true Church*, will think fit to *conclude* any thing) there is one part of the *ſtory* yet behinde, which will *refute* and *retort* that *argument*, for when *Edilfrid* had uſed them ſo *bloodily*, and in the heat of his *rage* and *victory* proceeded to deſtroy the *remainder* of thoſe *Monks*, and their *Monaſteries* together, the *avengers* of *blood* met him, three *Britiſh Commanders*, with their *forces*, *routed* his *Army*, killed *ten thouſand* and *ſixty* of them, *wounded* the *King*, and put him and the remainder of his *Army* to *flight*, which certainly is an *argument* of as much *validity* to inferre that *God* maintained the *cauſe* of thoſe *innocent Monks* againſt the *Saxons* and *Auguſtine*, as the former was *argumentative* on their ſide againſt the *Britiſh*.

23. But it is not needfull, that I inſiſt on either of theſe, the one thing that from this *view* of the *ſtory* in *Bede* was to be concluded, is onely this, that upon the *relations*, as in him they lie, and are by this *Author H.T.* vouched againſt us, there can be no doubt of our *Concluſion*, that the *Abbot* and *Monks* of *Bangor* oppoſed *Auguſtine*, yeilded him no *obedience*, referred themſelves onely to their own *Governours*, without any *acknowledgment* of *obedience* to the *Pope*; And this is generally the reſult of other *Authors* narrations of this matter.

24. So * *Balæus*, ſpeaking of that *convention*, *Dinotus omnium primus graviter & doctè de non approbandâ apud eos Romanorum authoritate diſputabat*, Dinoth *in the firſt place gravely and learnedly diſputed againſt the Authority of the Biſhops of* Rome *among them, adding*, *Fortiter præterea tuebatur Menevenſis Archiepiſcopi in Eccleſiarum ſuarum rebus ratam juriſdictionem*, *that he moreover ſtrongly and couragiouſly defended* the *validity* of the *juriſdiction of the Archbiſhop of S. Davids* (the ſame that in the *Abbots anſwer* is called the *Biſhop* of *Caerleon*) *in the affairs of his own Churches.*

* in *Dinoth.*

25. So *Geffrey* of *Monmouth*, *Edelbertus Rex Kantiorum, ut vidit Britones dedignantes ſubjectionem Auguſtino facere, Northumbrorum*

thumbrorum & cæteros Saxonum regules inſtimulavit, ut collecto grandi exercitu in civitatem Bangor Abbatem Dinoth & cæteros clericos, qui eos ſpreverunt, perditum irent. King Ethelbert *ſeeing the Britains diſdain to yeild their ſubjection to* Auguſtine, *ſtirred up the King of* Northumberland *and other Saxon Kings to gather a great army againſt the city* Bangor, *to deſtroy* Dinoth *the Abbot and the other Clerks of that Monaſterie, who had ſcorned* Auguſtine *and the Saxons.*

26. So *Sigebert* in *Anno* 602. *Auguſtinus— habita Synodo cum Britonum & Scotorum Epiſcopis, quâ ſacerdotes & Monachos invenit adverſarios æquitatis—* Auguſtine *had a meeting with the Britiſh and Scotiſh Biſhops, and there found an oppoſition from the Prieſts and Monks, and terrified them by prediction of a calamity that ſhould fall on them.* Other evidences to the ſame purpoſe are ſet down in the *Collection* of the *Anglicane Councels*, and Mr. *Whelock's Notes* on his *edition* of the *Saxon Bede*, p. 115. if there could now remain any *queſtion* of it.

27. And that this was diſcerned by the *Author* of this *Appendix*, if it had been for his *Intereſt* to have taken notice of it, is evident by his mention of the *miracle* and *divine vengeance*, as of proofs that *Auguſtine* was in the right againſt theſe *refuſers*, who yet continued, ſaith he, ſtill *refractory* to his *propoſals*. And this was all I concluded from the *Abbot's anſwer*, and this ſtands firm in this *Romaniſt's* own *confeſſion*, though the words of the *Abbot's anſwer* had not been preſerved to us.

28. And therefore being now wholly unconcerned in the *validity* of this *teſtimony*, and ſo ſecured from all danger of being *bribed* by *intereſts* to judge more favourably of it than the matter requires, I ſhall now proceed calmly to conſider, whether there be that *clearneſs* and *evidence* in this *Author's arguments* for the *invalidating* this *teſtimony*, which he aſſures us we ſhall finde in them.

29. His firſt *argument* is *negative* from the [*not leaſt ſcrap of Antiquity ſo much as pretended to prove that the Cambrian* (i. e. *Welch*) *lines cited, were the Abbot of* Bangor's *anſwer to* Auguſtine *upon the occaſion ſpecified, nor that the renowned* p. 405.

Dinoth *was that Abbot, nor that the old Manuſcr: whence Sir* Henry Spel: *extracts the teſtimony, was copied out of any more antient.*

30. What other *proof* from *antiquity* ſhould be expected from Sir *Henry Spelman* to give *authority* to theſe *lines*, than what readily offers it ſelf in this matter, I doe not underſtand; That the *Britiſh*, particularly thoſe of *Bangor*, and yet more peculiarly *Dinoth* the famous *Abbot* of that *Monaſterie*, diſputed againſt *Auguſtine's* pretenſions for the *authority* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, and aſſerted their own ſubjection to their *Metropolitane*, hath already appeared to be the *affirmation* of thoſe, who are moſt competent *witneſſes* of it; and the *Manuſcript* paſſage in *Welch* and *Engliſh*, which Sir *H. Spel:* had tranſcribed from Mr. *Moſton's Copie* (and directs the Reader to Sir *Robert Cotton's Library* to ſatisfie himſelf in that matter) is directly agreeable to this for the matter of it, and ſo gave that very *judicious Knight* juſt reaſon both to ſet ſome *value* on it himſelf, and to *communicate* it to others, as that which might gratifie their *curioſity*, and approve it ſelf by its own light to any *judicious Reader*, to be, if not the very words of that *Abbot's anſwer*, yet the *ſenſe* and *ſubſtance* of it, and whether of theſe it ſhould be judged to be, it matters not.

31. Had the *contents* of this *Teſtimony* been any way *contrary* to other undoubted *records* of thoſe times, or indeed any *diſparate* new relation, that had not formerly been taken notice of, and was now to owe the whole *credit* and *ſupport* to this *Teſtimonie*, ſome reaſon there might have been for an *Ariſtarchus* to proceed with more *caution* than here was uſed, and to yeild nothing to bare *groundleſſe conjectures* (and the *Romaniſt* hath as much reaſon as any man to lay this to heart, to act with this *caution* in other *Teſtimonies*) but when the matter is agreed on among the *Antients*, and an *old record* offers it ſelf to our view, in *perfect* concord with that which we had formerly all reaſon to *believe*, and onely affirms that more *legibly* and *diſtinctly*, which was in *ſubſtance* before, but not ſo *punctually* delivered to us, I cannot think the *ſevereſt Criticke*, ſuppoſing him *unconcerned* and *impartial*,

tial, without any *hypotheſis* of his own to be *defended* or *tended* by him, would have any *averſion* or diſlike to a *teſtimony* thus produced, though for ſome *circumſtances* of it, ſuch as are here mentioned, the producer have nothing of *authority* to back his own *conjectures*.

32. This one thing I am ſure is moſt *unjuſt*, not to give *credit* to a *Manuſcript*, that it is what it pretends to be, unleſſe I have ſome expreſſe *affirmation* of *Antiquity* concerning that *particular Manuſcript*; ſhould ſuch rules of ſeverity be now impoſed on the *preſſe*, the *Vatican* muſt never bring forth more *rarities*, the wealth of all the *Archives* in the world muſt lie *dead*, like a *Miſer's treaſure*, no one *volume* being able to teſtifie for the *veracity* of its *neighbour*, or if it were, it ſelf muſt alſo bring its *voucher* along with it, and ſo on *in infinitum*, or elſe it would not be ἴση μαρτυρία a *competent teſtification* in this matter, and when it is remembred, that all, which is now made *publick* by the help of *Printing*, lay once in *ſingle Manuſcripts*, and thoſe multipliable onely by *tranſcribing*, and neither the *originals* nor *Copies* any other way teſtified to be what they *pretended* to be, than as theſe *Cambrian* lines are delivered to us by Sir *Henry*, I hope this will be deemed a *competent* proof, that this firſt *argument* is not ſo *clearly demonſtrative* as was promiſed.

33. Another branch there is of this *firſt argument*, in theſe words, *And certainly if his Manuſcript be no elder than the interlined Engliſh, he hath groſsly wronged himſelf and his Reader, by honouring it with the ſtyle of Antient: For, as every one ſees, the Engliſh is purely modern, and cannot be ſo old by many years as* Henry *the Eighths caſhiering the Pope's authority, and arrogating the ſupremacy in Eccleſiaſticall matters to himſelf, for maintenance whereof it is alledged, and was certainly forged.* p. 405.

34. To this I *anſwer* briefly, that it is not pretended by Sir *Henry*, that the *Engliſh* is as antient as the times of *Dinoth*, no nor the *Welch* neither, but that thoſe two *Languages* were made uſe of by ſome, whoſe *ages* he pretends not to *know*, to conveigh to us intelligibly the *anſwer* of that *Abbot*, in what *language* ſoever it were delivered by him; And if it

ſhall now be granted to this *Author*, that the *Engliſh idiome* evidenceth it to be written within theſe laſt 100 years, this can be no *prejudice* or ground of *ſuſpition*, much leſſe a proof of *forgery* againſt this *Manuſcript*, as long as the *Welch* is allowed to be more *antient*, to which the *Engliſh* may upon a latter tranſcribing have been annext, as fitly as *old Greek MSS.* are daily printed with the *Latine tranſlations* of a later date, in the *ſame* or ſeveral *pages*.

35. His *ſecond argument* is deduced from the *Cambrian lines*,
p. 406, 7, 8. in which he pretends to diſcover many *un-Cambrian mixtures* of *Engliſh words*, *helpio* and *gleimio*, for *help* and *claim*, want of *Orthographie*, and the like; To which being utterly unskilfull in the *Welch language*, I acknowledge my ſelf *incompetent* to give any very *particular* reply, yet ſhall give my *reaſon*, why I cannot think that this *ſecond argument* of his is any more *demonſtrative* againſt the *validity* of the *teſtimony*, than the former; For 1. ſuppoſing this *Copie* of Mr. *Moſton* s to be a *tranſcript*, not the *original* (as it is evident S. *H. Spelman* ſuppoſeth) what difficulty is there to imagine, that that *Copie* was *tranſcribed* by one unskilful in the *Orthographie* of that *language*, eſpecially when it is known, how ordinary this is to be found, not only among the *vulgar*, but among learned *Church-men* of that nation, who are fain by ſtudy to *acquire* skill of reading before they can *officiate* in that *language*. *Secondly*, I ſhall readily *grant*, or, if he pleaſe, *yeild* to the force of his *arguments*, that the *Welch lines* are not the *words*, or *language* wherein *Dinoth* delivered his *anſwer*, but (as this *Gentleman* after contends) that *Dinoth*, a *writer* of *Latine Books*, being to ſpeak to *Auguſtine*, that underſtood not the *Britiſh langnage*, gave his *anſwer* in *Latine*; What hinders now, but that this *Latine anſwer* being conſerved among the *Britans*, might in *later* times (before *Henry* the *eight*) in any *age* to which the *idiome* of the *Welch lines* ſhall direct a *Critick* in that language to affix them, be tranſlated into *imperfect* (I mean more *modern*) yet *intelligible Welch*, either by a *native* of that *Countrey*, or by any other, who had *acquired* ſo much of that *language*, as was ſufficient for no weightier an *enterpriſe*? I diſcern not what *diſadvantage* I

can

can receive by this *conceſſion*, and then ſure there will be ſmall *difficulty* in *vindicating* Sir *Henry*'s integrity, if this ſhall be ſuppoſed; For he no where pretends, that the *Cambrian lines*, in the *form* here preſented, were the *language*, or *words* of the *anſwer* of *Dinoth*, but that the *matter* of his *anſwer*, in what *language* ſoever delivered by him, is *communicated* to us by that *MS.* And that it was not, here is no word of ſo much as *probable argument*, much leſſe of *clear demonſtration* tenderd by the *Author* of this *Appendix*.

36. *Laſtly*, for the two words which occaſioned his charge of the *Engliſh mixtures*, I am, by thoſe which have skill in the language, enabled to return him ſome *anſwer*, that the word *help*, from whence is the *infinitive helpio* or *helpu*, is found uſed by *Tudor Aled*, who wrote *an:* 1490. and by *Lluellyn*, who is thought to be more *antient*, and that *gleimio*, or *cleimio* is by the *Latine* and *Welch Dictionary* ſet down in the word *vendico*, in the *firſt* place, (and after that *holi*) as the moſt proper *Welch word* for it, not borrowed from the *Engliſh*; From whence as I ſhall not conclude, that theſe *Welch lines*, were the *original* of *Dinoth*'s anſwer (that were to *retract* my former *conceſſion*) ſo I may ſafely aſſume, that theſe *two* words (his onely inſtances of *Engliſh mixtures*) doe no way demonſtrate this *Welch tranſlation* to be later than *Henry the Eight's caſhiering the Pope's authority* (as of the *Engliſh* it was granted) nor conſequently leave it under *ſuſpition* of being *forged* by any *Proteſtant*.

37. His *third argument* is of more ſeeming force, taken from the mention of this *Abbot*'s *ſubjection* to the *Biſhop* of *Caerleon* upon *Uſke*, in which he findes two *abſurdities*, 1. ſaith he, *Bangor is very neer, if not in the Dioceſe of* Lhan Elwy, *now commonly called S.* Aſſaph, 2. *all Hiſtories teſtifie that the Archiepiſcopal Seat was removed from* Caerleon *to S.* David's *in King* Arthur's *time, who died about the year* 544. i. e. 50 *years before* Auguſtine's *firſt entrance into* Britain. p. 409.

38. To theſe two branches of *probation*, certainly the *anſwer* is very obvious to the firſt, that acknowledging and *ſuppoſing* that the *Monaſterie* of *Banchor*, ſituate in *Flintſhire*, though within the *confines* of *Cheſtſhire*, was under the *dioceſan Biſhop* either

either of S. *Aſaph*, or of *Cheſter* the *Epiſcopal See* of *Bangor* lying in the *County* of *Caernarven)* yet this can be of no manner of force againſt this *teſtimony*, for he that was under the *Biſhop* of S. *Aſaph*, as his *immediate ſuperior*, or *dioceſan*, may yet be under the *Biſhop* of *Caerleon*, as his *Metropolitan*, as he that is under the *Biſhop* of *Rocheſter* in one reſpect, is under the *Biſhop* of *Canterbury* in another. And ſo that is a full *anſwer* to his firſt *difficulty*.

39. For the *ſecond*, it is acknowledged that before this time of *Dinoth*'s anſwer to *Auguſtine*, the *Archiepiſcopal See* had been by *authority* of *Synod* removed firſt from *Caerleon* to *Landaffe* by *Dubritius*, *Anno* 512. and ſo it is affirmed by Sir *Hen: Spelman* in his *Apparat:* p. 25. (where by the way *lin:* 5. the *Printer* hath miſtaken *ad Meneviam* for *ad Landaviam*) and in like manner by his ſucceſſor S. *David*, *Anno* 516. by *licence* from *King Arthur*, from *Landaff* to *Menevia*, which from that *eminent Biſhop*, under whom that *change* was made, was after called S. *Davids*. But this removal of the *Metropolitical See* from one city to another was not of ſuch *weight* or *conſideration*, but that the *Metropolitical dignity*, having been ſo long fixt at *Caerleon*, might ſtill retain that *title* after the *tranſlation*.

40. Beſides, the *Abbot* of *Bangor* making anſwer to *Auguſtine*'s claim, which was founded in ſome *old* right, which he pretended the *Pope* to have over *all Churches*, it was moſt proper to *conteſt* this by *former* practice, not onely how it ſtood at that *preſent*, but eſpecially how it had been ἄνωθεν ἢ ἐξ ἀρχῆς, of *old*, or from the *beginning*, by *cuſtome immemorial*, and herein not to conſider ſuch *immaterial changes*, as were the removing of the *Primate*'s *See* from one *city* to another, but to look on it, as it had alwaies layn, in *oppoſition* to all *forreign juriſdiction*: And it being certain that *Caerleon* was antiently this *Prime See*, nothing was more agreeable to this *conteſt*, as it is ſuppoſed to be managed by that *Abbot*, than thus to referre to the ἀρχαῖα ἔθη (as the *Councels* of *Nice*, and *Antioch*, and *Chalcedon*, and *Epheſus* had done, in the like *controverſies*) to tell *Auguſtine* that the *Britiſh Chriſtians* had alwaies, from their firſt *plantation*, been under a

Britiſh

British Primate, and to call the *British Primate* by that title, which had moſt antiently belonged to him, i. e. *Biſhop* of *Caerleon*, and not by the later of *Landaffe*, or the yet later of S. *Davids*.

42. What this *Author* here objects againſt the *former* of theſe *anſwers*, ſaying, 1. That this is not *proved*. And 2. that *it implies a contradiction to ſay the See was tranſlated, and the former title ſtill retained, Tranſlation importing* the *taking a new, and deſertion of the old title*,] is no way applicable to this *ſecond anſwer* (which conſequently remains in full force) and therefore I need not farther *attend* to it; And in *relation* to the former *anſwer*, It is farre from the promiſed *clearneſſe* of *demonſtration*.

43. For as to the *firſt* part of it, the thing may be *true*, though it be not *proved*, the *contrary* muſt be *proved* by him that promiſeth *clear* or *demonſtrative* confutations: And for the *ſecond*, it muſt be founded in ſome *new* notion of *Contradiction*, which my *Logick* hath not acquainted me with, for ſure he that ſaith the *See* was *tranſlated*, and the *former title retained*, doth neither ſay that the *See* was *tranſlated* and *not tranſlated* (which is the only *form* of a *Logical contradiction*) nor that the *former title* was *retained* and *not retained*; Nor *conſequently* can I diſcern the leaſt *inconvenience*, much leſſe *contradiction*, either *direct*, or by way of *implication*, that the *Metropolitical See* being *tranſlated* from *Caerleon* to another *city*, the *Metropolitan* ſhould ſtill retain his *original* title, that of *Biſhop* of *Caerleon*.

44. Other *exceptions* he proceeds to adde, but thoſe ſo farre again from being, according to *promiſe*, *demonſtrative evidences* againſt this *teſtimonie*, that they are no way *worthy* to be attended to. p. 410.

45. *Firſt*, that *Dinoth* would *probably* have *anſwered* in *Latine*, and to that I have already replied, that I may well grant he did ſo, and conſequently that both the *Welch* and *Engliſh* in Mr. *Moſton's MS.* were *tranſlations* of that *Latine*.

46. *Secondly*, that the words in *Welch* rendred [*whom you name to be Pope*—] are not *rightly tranſlated*; In this again I cannot contend, having no *knowledge* in that *language*, but as

before I followed Sir *Henry*'s *tranſlation*, and finding it not very *clear*, did endevour to expreſſe his meaning by a juſt *Paraphraſe*, and thereby happily rendred the *true* ſenſe of the place, ſo if I ſhould now believe my *teacher* again, this *Author*, that undertakes to correct Sir *Henry*'s *tranſlation*, it would not be impoſſible ſo to *render* the *words*, as ſhould bear a very *commdious* ſenſe, and perfectly agreeable to the notion I formerly had of them.

47. But being not ſecure that my leader *H. T.* (whom now I diſcern to be no *Welch-man*) hath *really* the skill in that *language*, which his *animadverſions* pretend to, I thought it more reaſonable to conſult ſome other more knowing *guide*, and am now from a *judicious* hand aſſured, that there is an *error* in the *diſtinction* between *Daad:* and *yw gleimio*, which being taken away, the true *rendring* of the whole is this, *Et aliam obedientiam, quam iſtam, non agnoſco ego cujuſquam eſſe, quem vos nominatis Papam, vel patrem patrum, vendicare & poſtulare, And any other obedience than that, I acknowledge not to be any mans* (or to *belong* to any man) *whom ye name Pope, or Father of Fathers, to challenge and require.* This is *plain* ſenſe, and ſtill perfectly agreeable to the *underſtanding*, I formerly had of the *words*, and I doubt not but upon the moſt *Critical* examination it will be found to be the moſt *literal* rendring of them.

48. The *third*, of the no good ſenſe of the *Engliſh* is already anſwered alſo, by adhering to that better *tranſlation*, which is as perfectly fit for our turns, as the other was *imagined* to be, and much more *intelligible* and clear, as appeared in the *laſt number*.

49. The *fourth* is, that the words uſed of the *Biſhop* of *Caerleon*. [*who is to overſee under God over us*] *makes againſt the aym of the Prelatick reformers*, and particularly againſt *me*, who *labour to ſupport* the *King*'s *Supremacie* againſt the *Pope*, whereas theſe words *exclude the King as well as the Pope*] But certainly there is no *force* in this, for *Auguſtine*'s demand, or *queſtion* being onely of that *obedience* and *ſubordination* which belonged to the *ſupreme Biſhop*, whether that were the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, or the *Biſhop* of *Caerleon*, and nor at all inquiring

quiring into the *nature* or *extent* of the *regal* or *imperial* power (there being no *occaſion* to ſuggeſt any ſuch *inquirie*) the *Abbot's anſwer* can in no probability be *extended* any farther than the *queſtion* extended, i. e. to the aſſerting the *Prime Epiſcopal power* to belong to the *Metropolitan* of *Caerleon* or S. *David's*, without any *ſubordination* to the *Pope* of *Rome*.

50. As for that which in the *fift* place he adds of the *miracle* and *divine vengeance*, in *Bede*, and ſo concludes his *Appendix*, to that I have ſpoken * already, in that which I thought meet to *premiſe* to this debate, and ſo I have no more to adde by way of *anſwer* to his *exceptions*, but that I cannot ſufficiently wonder, that this *Author* (ſo recommended to the the Reader by his *learned* Friend in the front of his Book) ſhould make it his ſolemn buſineſſe to invalidate this one *ſupernumerary teſtimony*, being withall no better provided with *arguments* to promiſe him *ſucceſſe* in it. * n. 19, 20.

The End.

ERRATA.

PAge 4. line 28. after *him* adde ,
p.15. l.24. after *ſide* re: *or*
p.33. marg: l.3. re: *Apolog:*
l.29. after *muſt* adde , .
p.36. l.32. re: *nomina*
p.40. l.12. re: θελήσατε
l.13. re: εὐχερῶς
p. 83. l. 34. re: προλαβοῦσης συνηθείας
p.15. l.24. after πράξει *dele* ,
p.19. l.33. after *elſe* adde)
p.90. l.17. for μοῦ re: μοῦ
l.20. for *the* re: *then*
p.96. l.*ult:* re: αὐτοκεφαλία
p.108. l.30. re: *teſtifie*
p.111. marg: l.11. re: ἐπισκοπὰς
p.120. l.26. re: *it as*
p.121. l.11. re: *Campegius*
p.129. l.8. re: ἔργον
l.6. re: *yet larger*
p 133. l.17. re: *by this*
p.135. l.6. re: *ſchiſm in him,*
p.136. l.35. re: συγγράφειν
p.137. l.29. re: *and ſhall*
l.32. re: *extitit*
p.138. l.*ult:* re: *is one*
p.141. l.7. re: *are by us believed to be con-*
l.24. re: *our innocence*
p.148. l.36. re: *is utterly*
p.150. l.7. re: *this*
p.155. l.11. re: *the fall*
p.160. l.36. re: διασάφησις
p.161. l.11. re: *Naucratius*